



भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 32] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, अगस्त 6, 1983/श्रावण 15, 1905
No. 32] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, AUGUST 6, 1983/SRAVANA 15, 1905

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके
Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii) PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़ कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांविधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Statutory Orders and Notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence)

विधि, न्याय और कम्पनी कार्य मंत्रालय
(विधि कार्य विभाग)

सूचनाएं

नई दिल्ली, 8 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 3041.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री सोम प्रकाश धवन, एडवोकेट दिल्ली ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अर्धीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे पटियाला हाउस, नई दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति को नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० फा० 5(54)/83-न्या०]

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Department of Legal Affairs)

NOTICES

New Delhi, the 8th July, 1983

S.O. 3041.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, 492GI/83—I

that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Som Parkash Dhawan, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Patiala House, New Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(54)/83-Judl.]

का० आ० 3042.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री राजवीर सिंह, एडवोकेट दिल्ली ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अर्धीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे शाहदरा कोर्ट दिल्ली में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति को नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इस सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० फा० 5(55)/83-न्या०]

S.O. 3042.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of Rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Rajvir Singh, Advocate for appointment as a Notary to practise in Shahdara Courts, Delhi.

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(55)/83-Judl.]

नई दिल्ली, 13 जुलाई, 1983

फा० आ० 3043.—नोटरीज नियम, 1956 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में सक्षम प्राधिकारी द्वारा यह सूचना दी जाती है कि श्री इन्द्र लाल गुप्ता, एडवोकेट जयपुर ने उक्त प्राधिकारी को उक्त नियम के नियम 4 के अर्धीन एक आवेदन इस बात के लिए दिया है कि उसे जयपुर सिटी, राजस्थान में व्यवसाय करने के लिए नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्त किया जाए।

2. उक्त व्यक्ति की नोटरी के रूप में नियुक्ति पर किसी भी प्रकार का आक्षेप इन सूचना के प्रकाशन के चौदह दिन के भीतर लिखित रूप में मेरे पास भेजा जाए।

[सं० फा० 5(56)/83-न्या०]

के० सी० डी० गंग्वानी, सक्षम प्राधिकारी

New Delhi, the 13th July, 1983

S.O. 3043.—Notice is hereby given by the Competent Authority in pursuance of rule 6 of the Notaries Rules, 1956, that application has been made to the said Authority, under rule 4 of the said Rules, by Shri Inder Lal Gupta, Advocate, Jaipur (Raj.) for appointment as a Notary to practise in Jaipur City (Raj.)

2. Any objection to the appointment of the said person as a Notary may be submitted in writing to the undersigned within fourteen days of the publication of this Notice.

[No. F. 5(56)/83-Judl.]

K. C. D. GANGWANI, Competent Authority

गृह मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1983

फा० आ० 3044.—मंत्रिधान के अनुच्छेद 258 के खंड (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, राष्ट्रपति, राजस्थान सरकार की सहमति से, वरिष्ठ पुलिस अधीक्षक (अपराध जांच विभाग) आसूचना न्यूरो, जयपुर जोन को, उसके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार में, विदेशी अधिनियम 1946 (1946 का 31) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (2) के खंड (क), (ख), (ग) और (गग) में निर्दिष्ट प्रकार के आदेश देने के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार के कार्य भी, निम्नलिखित शर्तों पर एतद्वारा सौंपते हैं, अर्थात्:—

- (क) कि ऐसे सौंपे गए कार्यों का पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रियों के बारे में ही प्रयोग किया जाएगा ;
- (ख) ऐसे कार्य करते समय उक्त वरिष्ठ पुलिस अधीक्षक राजस्थान सरकार या केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा समय-समय पर जारी किए गए सामान्य या विशेष अनुदेशों का पालन करेगा ; और
- (ग) ऐसी सुपुर्दगी के बावजूद केन्द्रीय सरकार किसी भी मामले में यदि ऐसा करना उचित समझे तो, उक्त कार्यों में से कोई भी कार्य स्वयं कर सकती है।

[संख्या 12011/11/83-एफ० III]

एच० एस० गाबा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1983

S.O. 3044.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 258 of the Constitution the President, with the consent of the Government of Rajasthan, hereby entrusts also to the Senior Superintendents of Police, Criminal Investigation Department (Intelligence Branch), Zone Jaipur within his jurisdiction, the functions of the Central Government in making orders of the nature specified in clauses (a), (b), (c), and (cc) of sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Foreigners Act, 1946 (31 of 1946), subject to the following conditions, namely:—

- (a) that the functions so entrusted shall be exercised in respect of nationals of Pakistan;
- (b) that in exercise of such functions the said Senior Superintendent of Police shall comply with such general or special directions as the Government of Rajasthan or the Central Government may from time to time issue; and
- (c) that notwithstanding this entrustment, the Central Government may itself exercise any of the said functions should it deem fit to do so in any case.

[No. 12011/11/83-F.III]

H. S. GABA, Under Secy.

(कानून और प्रशासनिक सुधार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1983

फा० आ० 3045.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन अधिनियम, 1946 (1946 का 25) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, निम्नलिखित शर्तों को ऐसे शर्तों के रूप में निर्दिष्ट करती है, जिनका अन्वेषण दिल्ली विशेष पुलिस स्थापन द्वारा किया जाएगा, अर्थात्:—

- (क) विधिविरुद्ध क्रियाकलाप (निवारण) अधिनियम, 1967 (1967 का 37) के अर्धीन दंडनीय अपराध।

(ख) उपरोक्त अपराधों में से एक या अधिक अपराधों के संबंध में या उनसे संबंधित प्रयत्न, दुष्प्रेरण और षड्यन्त्र तथा वैसे ही तथ्यों से उत्पन्न होने वाले वैसे ही संव्यवहार के अनुक्रम में किया गया कोई अन्य अपराध ।

[संख्या 228/14/83-ए० वी० डी० -II]

के० जी० गोयल, उप सचिव

(Department of Personnel and Administrative Reforms)

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1983

S.O. 3045.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, 1946 (25 of 1946), the Central Government hereby specifies the following offences as offences which are to be investigated by the Delhi Special Police Establishment, namely:—

- (a) Offences punishable under the Unlawful Activities (Prevention) Act, 1967 (37 of 1967).
- (b) Attempts, abetments and conspiracies in relation to, or in connection with, one or more of the offences mentioned above, and any other offence committed in the course of the same transaction arising out of the same facts.

[No. 228/14/83-AVD.II]

K. G. GOEL, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3046 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार 'राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उप-नियम (4) के अनुसरण में एतद्वारा केन्द्रीय अन्वेषण ब्यूरो के निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके 80 प्रतिशत से अधिक स्टाफ ने हिन्दी का कार्य-साधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है अधिमूचित करती है:—

1. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, पटना ।
2. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, राँची ।
3. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, लखनऊ ।
4. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, देहरादून ।
5. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, जयपुर ।
6. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, जबलपुर ।
7. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, चण्डीगढ़ ।
8. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, साधारण अपराध स्कन्ध, दिल्ली ।
9. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, अधिक अपराध स्कन्ध, दिल्ली ।
10. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, सी०आई० यू० (1), नई दिल्ली ।
11. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय सी० आई० यू० (2), नई दिल्ली ।

12. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, सी० आई० यू० (3), नई दिल्ली ।

13. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, सी० आई० यू० (ए), नई दिल्ली ।

14. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, सी० आई० यू० (एन०स्मि०), नई दिल्ली ।

15. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय सी० आई० यू० (ई०-II), नई दिल्ली ।

16. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, सी० आई० यू० (वी०), नई दिल्ली ।

17. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, अहमदाबाद

18. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, साधारण अपराध स्कन्ध, बम्बई ।

19. पुलिस अधीक्षक के० अ० ब्यूरो का कार्यालय, एस० आई० सी०, नई दिल्ली ।

[सं० 11017/19/83-हिन्दी]

शिव कुमार मिश्र, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 25th July, 1983

S.O. 3046.—In pursuance of Sub Rule (4) of Rule 10 of the Official Languages (use for Official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, Central Government hereby notifies the following offices of the CBI, more than 80 per cent of the staff whereof have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Patna.
2. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Ranchi.
3. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Lucknow.
3. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Dehradun.
5. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Jaipur.
6. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Jabalpur.
7. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Chandigarh.
8. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, General Offences Wing, Delhi.
9. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Economic Offences Wing, Delhi.
10. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI CIU(I) New Delhi
11. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U. (II), New Delhi.
12. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U.(III), New Delhi.
13. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U.(A), New Delhi.
14. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U.(NC), New Delhi.
15. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U.(E.II), New Delhi.
16. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, C.I.U.(B), New Delhi.
17. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, Ahmedabad.
18. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, General Offences Wing, Bombay.
19. Office of the Supdt. of Police, CBI, S.I.C., New Delhi

[No. 11017/19/83-Hindi]

S. K. MISRA, Director

वित्त मंत्रालय**(राजस्व विभाग)**

नई दिल्ली, 4 जुलाई, 1983

आयकर

का०आ० 3047.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23ग) के खण्ड (V) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा “दि रोमन कैथोलिक डायोसीज आफ कालीकट” को उम धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ-कर-निर्धारण वर्ष 1982-83 से 1984-85 के अन्तर्गत आने वाली अवधि के लिए अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 5308/फा० सं० 197/94/83-आ०क० (नि०-1)]

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3047.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (v) of sub-section (23C) of Section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies “The Roman Catholic Diocese of Calicut” for the purpose of the said section for the period covered by the assessment years 1982-83 to 1984-85.

[No. 5308/(F. No. 197/94/83-IT(AI))]

नई दिल्ली, 18 जुलाई, 1983

आयकर

का०आ० 3048.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 10 की उपधारा (23 ग) के खण्ड (iv) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा, “दी डिवीन लाइफ सोसायटी” को उक्त धारा के प्रयोजनार्थ कर-निर्धारण वर्ष 1983-84 से 1985-86 तक के अन्तर्गत आने वाली अवधि के लिए अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 5315/फा० सं० 197/74/83-आ०क० (नि०-1)]

वी० बी० श्रोनिवासन, निदेशक

New Delhi, the 18th July, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3048.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (iv) of sub-section (23C) of section 10 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies “The Divine Life Society” for the purpose of the said section for the period covered by the assessment years 1983-84 to 1985-86.

[No. 5315/F. No. 197/74/83-IT(AI)]
V. B. SRINIVASAN, Director.

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 1983

आयकर

का० आ० 3049.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80-छ की उपधारा (2) (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा “आडि काडालई श्री कृष्ण टैम्पल, पोस्ट आफिस

काडालई, कण्णूर (केरल)” को केरल राज्य में सर्वत्र विख्यात लोक पूजा-स्थान के रूप में अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 5158/फा० सं० 176/69/81-आ० क० (नि० I)]

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 1983

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3049.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) (b) of Section 80-G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies “Adi Kadalai Sree Krishna Temple, P.O. Kadalai, Cannanore (Kerala)” to be a place of public worship of renown throughout the State of Kerala.

[No. 5158/F. No. 176/69/81-IT(AI)]

आयकर

का० आ० 3050.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80-छ की उपधारा (2) (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा “आरुलमिगु एल्लामन टैम्पल, परियामेट मद्रास-3” को तमिलनाडु राज्य में सर्वत्र विख्यात लोक पूजा के स्थान के रूप में अधिसूचित करती है।

[सं० 5159/फा० सं० 176/17/83-आ० क० (नि० 1)]

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3050.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) (b) of Section 80-G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies “Arulmigu Ellamman Temple, Periamet, Madras-3,” to be a place of public worship of renown throughout the State of Tamil Nadu.

[No. 5159/F. No. 176/17/83-IT(AI)]

आयकर

का० आ० 3051.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 80-छ की उपधारा (2) (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा “श्री वेंकटचलपति स्वामी टैम्पल, ओपिलियाप्पन कोइल तिरुनागेश्वरम पोस्ट आफिस (तमिलनाडु)” को तमिल नाडु राज्य में सर्वत्र विख्यात लोक पूजा का स्थान के रूप में अधिसूचित करती है। यह स्पष्ट किया जाता है कि इस अधिसूचना के प्रयोजनार्थ केवल मरम्मत/नवीकरण के लिए दान की धारा 80-छ (2) (ख) के अन्तर्गत राहत के योग्य होंगे।

[सं० 5160/फा० सं० 176/15/83-आ० क० (नि० 1)]

मिलाप जैन, अवर सचिव

INCOME-TAX

S.O. 3051.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) (b) of Section 80-G of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby notifies “Sri Venkatachalapathy Swamy Temple. Oppiliyappan Koil, Tirunageswaram, P.O. (Tamil Nadu)” to be a place of public worship of renown throughout the State of Tamil Nadu. It is clarified that for the purposes of this notification donations for repairs/renovations only will qualify for relief under section 80-G(2) (b).

[No. 5160/F. No. 176/15/83-IT(AI)]
MILAP JAIN, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

नई दिल्ली, 22 अप्रैल, 1983

(आयकर)

क्रा० आ० 3052.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा दिनांक 18-2-82 की अपनी अधिसूचना सं० 5094 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

क्रम संख्या 13-क के सामने की प्रविष्टियों को निम्नानुसार प्रतिस्थापित किया जायेगा :—

क्रम सं० आयकर आयुक्त प्रधान कार्यालय क्षेत्राधिकार

13-क	त्रिवेन्द्रम	त्रिवेन्द्रम	1. आयकर परिमंडल, त्रिवेन्द्रम।
			2. वेतन परिमंडल, त्रिवेन्द्रम।
			3. आयकर परिमंडल, क्विलोन।
			4. आयकर परिमंडल, एलेप्पी।
			5. आयकर परिमंडल, तिरुवल्ला।
			6. आयकर परिमंडल, कोट्टायाम।

यह अधिसूचना 15 अप्रैल, 1983 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 5157/फा० सं० 189/5/81-आ० क० (नि० -I)]
मिलाप जैन, अवर सचिव,

CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

New Delhi, the 22nd April, 1983

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 3052.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby makes the following amendments to its notification No. 5094 dated 18-2-82.

The entries against Sl. No. 13-A shall be substituted as follows:—

S. Commissioner of Income-Tax	Headquarters	Jurisdiction
1	2	3
13A	Trivandrum	Trivandrum
		1. I.T. Circle, Trivandrum.
		2. Salary Circle, Trivandrum.

1 2 3 4

3. Income-tax Circle, Quilon.

4. Income-tax Circle, Alleppey.

5. Income-tax Circle, Thiruvalla.

6. Income-tax Circle, Kottayam.

This notification shall take effect from 15th April, 1983.

[No. 5157/F. No. 189/5/81-IT(AI)]

MILAP JAIN. Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

क्रा० आ० 3053.—आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए और जारी की गयी पूर्ववर्ती अधिसूचनाओं में आंशिक संशोधन करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निदेश देता है कि नीचे दी गई अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट अधिकार-क्षेत्रों के आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टियों में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर बाडों, परिमंडलों, जिलों और रेंजों में ऐसे व्यक्तियों के संबंध में अपने कार्य करेंगे जिन पर आयकर या अतिकर या ब्याजकर लगाया गया हो और जो आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (क) से (ज) में कंपनी (लाभ) अतिकर अधिनियम, 1964 (1964 का 7) की धारा 11 की उपधारा (1) में और ब्याजकर अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 45) की धारा 15 की उपधारा (1) में उल्लिखित किसी भी आदेश से व्यथित हुए हैं और ऐसे व्यक्तियों या व्यक्तियों के वर्गों की बाबत भी कार्य करेंगे जिनके लिए बोर्ड ने आयकर अधिनियम, 1961 की धारा 246 की उपधारा (2) के खण्ड (1) के उपबंधों के अनुसार निदेश दिया है या भविष्य में निदेश दें।

अनुसूची

अधिकार क्षेत्र और प्रधान कार्यालय	आयकर बोर्ड/परिमंडल/जिला रेंज
1	2
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-1 नई दिल्ली	1. नि० सं० आ० रेंज-6क, नई दिल्ली और सभी बाडों/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार में आते हैं।

1	2	1	2
	<p>2. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-6-क, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०-1-ख, नई दिल्ली कहलाती थी) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार में आते हैं।</p> <p>3. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-6-ग, नई दिल्ली (इससे पहले जिसका पद नि० स० आ०, रेंज-1ग, नई दिल्ली था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>4. नि० स० आ०, कंपनी रेंज-2, नई दिल्ली (पहले जो नि० स० आ०, रेंज-1घ, नई दिल्ली के रूप में पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>5. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-13, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>		<p>3. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2(1), नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ० रेंज-4-ड, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>4. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-14, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-2, नई दिल्ली	<p>1. नि० स० आ०, कंपनी रेंज-3, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>	आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-5, नई दिल्ली	<p>1. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-4-क, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>2. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-4-ख, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>3. नि० स० आ०, कंपनी रेंज-1, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ० रेंज-1-क नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>4. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-1, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ० रेंज-1ड, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित थी) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-4, नई दिल्ली	<p>1. नि० स० आ०, 4-ग, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p> <p>2. नि० स० आ०, कान्ट्रेक्ट्स रेंज, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ० रेंज-2-घ नई दिल्ली के रूप में पदनामित थी) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>		<p>5. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-2, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-1-च, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।</p>

1	2	1	2
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-II, नई दिल्ली	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-3-क, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-3-ख, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-3-ग, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 4. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धारित) रेंज-9, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि०स०आ० रेंज-3-ड, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 5. नि०स०आ०, (निर्धारित) रेंज-10, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि०स० आ०, रेंज-3-च, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धारण) रेंज-11, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि०स०आ०, रेंज-5-ड, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 5. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धारण) रेंज-12, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-5-च, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 6. नि० स० आ०, सर्वेक्षण रेंज, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 7. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धारण) रेंज-13, और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 	
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-7, नई दिल्ली	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. नि०स०आ०, रेंज-5-क, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-5-ख, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-5-ग, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 	आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-8, नई दिल्ली	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. नि० स० आ०, (सेंट्रल) रेंज-1, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, (सेंट्रल) रेंज-6, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, (सेंट्रल) रेंज-2, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।

1	2	1	2
	4. नि० स० आ०, (सैट्रल) रेंज-4, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।		और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/ जिले जो इस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार में आते हैं।
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-9, नई दिल्ली	1. नि० स० आ०, (सैट्रल) रेंज-3, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, (सैट्रल) रेंज-5, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/ जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।		2. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-6, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज 2-ज, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, (अधि- ग्रहण) रेंज-1, नई दिल्ली। 4. नि० स० आ०, (अधिग्रहण) रेंज-2, नई दिल्ली।
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-10, नई दिल्ली	1. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धारण) रेंज-3, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2-ड, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/ परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-4, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2- घ, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-15, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं।	आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-12, नई दिल्ली	1. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-3-घ, नई दिल्ली और सभी वार्ड/ परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 2. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-7, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-4-घ, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/ जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 3. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-8, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज- 4-छ, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) और सभी के क्षेत्राधिकार के अंतर्गत आते हैं। 4. नि० स० आ०, रेंज-6-घ, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2-ख, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पद- नामित था) और सभी वार्ड/परिमंडल/जिले जो उस रेंज के क्षेत्राधिकार में आते हैं।
आयकर आयुक्त (अपील)-11, नई दिल्ली	1. नि० स० आ०, (निर्धा०) रेंज-5, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2-छ, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था)		

1	2
	5. कंपनी परिमंडल-9, नि० स० आ०, कंपनी रेंज-3, नई दिल्ली (जो पहले नि० स० आ०, रेंज-2-क, नई दिल्ली के नाम से पदनामित था) के अंतर्गत है।

जहां कोई आयकर वार्ड, परिमंडल, जिला अथवा रेंज अथवा उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक अधिकार-क्षेत्र से अन्य अधिकार-क्षेत्र में अंतरित कर दिया गया है, वहां आयकर वार्ड, परिमंडल, जिला अथवा रेंज अथवा उसके किसी भाग में किए गए कर-निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और इस अधिसूचना से तत्काल पूर्व उस अधिकार-क्षेत्र के समक्ष विचाराधीन पड़ी अपीलें, जिसके अधिकार क्षेत्र से यह आयकर वार्ड, परिमंडल, जिला अथवा रेंज अथवा उनका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया है, इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से उस आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) के अधिकार-क्षेत्र को अंतरित की जायेंगी और उसके द्वारा निपटायी जायेंगी, जिसके अधिकार-क्षेत्र में उक्त वार्ड, परिमंडल, जिला अथवा रेंज अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित कर दिया गया है।

यह अधिसूचना 1-7-1983 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5310/फा० सं० 261/10/83-आ० क० न्या०]

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3053.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 121A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in partial modification of the notifications issued earlier, the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby directs that the Commissioners of Income-tax (Appeals) of the charges specified in column No. (1) of the schedule below, shall perform their functions in respect of such persons assessed to Income-tax or Surtax or interest tax in the Income-tax Wards, Circles, Districts and Ranges specified in the corresponding entries in column 2 thereof as are aggrieved by any of the orders mentioned in clauses (a) to (h) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961, in sub-section (1) of section 11 of Companies (Profits) Sur-tax Act, 1964 (7 of 1964) and in sub-section (1) of section 15 of the Interest Tax Act, 1974 (45 of 1974) and also in respect of such persons or classes of persons as the Board has directed or may direct in future in accordance with the provisions of clause (1) of sub-section (2) of section 246 of the Income-tax Act, 1961.

492 GI/83—2

SCHEDULE

Charges with Headquarters	Income-tax Wards/Circles/Distts./Ranges.
1	2
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-I, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-VI, A, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	2. IAC, Range-VI-B, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-B, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	3. IAC, Range-VI-C, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-C, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	4. IAC, Companies Range-II, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-D, New Delhi) and all Wards / Circles / Districts within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	5. IAC (Asstt.) Range-XIII, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeal)-II, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Companies Range-III, N, Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-A, New Delhi) and all Wards/ Circles/ Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range excluding Company Circle-IX.
Commissioner of Income tax (Appeals)-VI, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-IV-C, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Districts within the Jurisdiction of that Range.
	2. IAC, Contractors Range, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-D, N, Delhi) and all Wards/ Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	3. IAC, Range-II(1), New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-IV-E, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.

1	2	1	2
	4. IAC, Asstt. Range-XIV, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		5. IAC (Asstt.) Range-X, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-III-F, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-V, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-IV-A, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.	Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-VII, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-V-A, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of the Range.
	2. IAC, Range-IV-B, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		2. IAC, Range-V-B, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	3. IAC, Companies Range-I New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-A New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		3. IAC, Range-V-C, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	4. IAC (Asstt.) Range-I, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-E, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		4. IAC (Asstt.) Range-XI, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-V-E, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	5. IAC (Asstt.) Range-II, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-I-F, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		5. IAC (Asstt.) Range-XII, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range III-F, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-VI, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-III-A, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		6. IAC, Survey Range, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	2. IAC, Range-III-B, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		7. IAC, Asstt. Range-XVI and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	3. IAC, Range-III-C, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.	Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-VIII, New Delhi.	1. IAC(C) Range-I, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	4. IAC (Asstt.) Range-IX, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-III-E, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		2. IAC(C) Range-VI, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
			3. IAC(C) Range-II, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.

1	2	1	2
	4. IAC(C) Range-IV, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		2. IAC (Asstt.) Range-VII, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-IV-D, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-IX New Delhi.	1. IAC(C) Range-III, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		3. IAC(Asstts.) Range-VIII, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-IV-G/ New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
	2. IAC(C) Range-V, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		4. IAC, Range-VI-D, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-B, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-X, New Delhi.	1. IAC(Asstt.) Range-III, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-E, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		5. Company Circle-IX, within the jurisdiction of IAC, Companies Range-III, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-A, New Delhi).
	2. IAC(Asstt.) Range-IV, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-F, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		
	3. IAC, Asstt. Range-XV, and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-XI, New Delhi.	1. IAC (Asstt.) Range-V, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-G, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		
	2. IAC(Asstt.) Range-VI, New Delhi (formerly designated as IAC, Range-II-H, New Delhi) and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		
	3. IAC(Acquisition) Range-I, New Delhi.		
	4. IAC(Acquisition) Range-II, New Delhi.		
Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals)-XII, New Delhi.	1. IAC, Range-III-D, New Delhi and all Wards/Circles/Distts. within the jurisdiction of that Range.		

Whereas Income-tax Ward, Circle, District or Range or part thereof stands transferred by this Notification from one charge to another charge, appeals arising out of assessment made in that Income-tax Ward, Circle, District or Range or part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) of the charge from whom the Income-tax Ward, Circle, District or Range or part thereof is transferred, are to be dealt with by the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals) of the charge to whom the said Ward, Circle District or Range or part thereof is transferred.

This Notification shall take effect from 1-7-1983.

[No. 5310(F.No. 261/10/83-ITJ)]

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3054.—बोर्ड की दिनांक 4-2-82 की अधिसूचना सं० 4459 (फा० सं 261/24/81- आ० क० मन्था० में आयकर आयुक्त (अपील एनांकुलम के क्षेत्राधिकार के सामने अनुसूची की मद सं० 2 के स्तम्भ 2 में निम्नलिखित को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा :—

2. (क) सर्वोच्च परिमंडल I एनांकुलम।

2. (ख) सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल-II, एर्नाकुलम।

यह अधिसूचना पीछे की तारीख अर्थात् 2-8-82 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5316 (फा० सं० 261/5/83-आ० क० न्या०)]

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1983

S.O. 3054.—In the Board's Notification No. 4459 (F. No. 261/24/81-ITJ) dated 4-2-82 under Column 2 of the Schedule item No. 2 against the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals), Ernakulam shall be substituted with the following :—

2 (a) Survey Circle-I, Ernakulam.

2 (b) Survey Circle-II, Ernakulam.

This notification shall take retrospective effect from 2-8-82.

[No. 5316 (F. No. 261/5/83-ITJ)]

फा० आ० 3055.—बोर्ड की दिनांक 20-7-83 की अधिसूचना 5316 (फा० सं० 261/5/83-आ० क० न्या०) द्वारा यथा संशोधित दिनांक 4-2-1982 की अधिसूचना सं० 4459 (फा० सं० 261/24/81-आ० क० न्या०) में अनुसूची की मद सं० 2 (क) तथा 2 (ख) के स्तम्भ 2 के अंतर्गत आयकर आयुक्त (अपील एर्नाकुलम के क्षेत्राधिकार के सामने उल्लिखित शब्दों का लोप करके निम्नलिखित को मद सं० 2 के रूप में प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा :—

2. सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल एर्नाकुलम

यह अधिसूचना 15-4-1983 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 5317 (फा० सं० 261/5/83-आ० क० न्या०)]

S.O. 3055.—In the Board's notification No. 4459 (F. No. 261/24/81-ITJ) dated 4-2-82 as amended by Notification No. 5316 (F. No. 261/5/83-ITJ) dated 20-7-83, under column 2 of the Schedule items No. 2(a) and 2(b) against the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeal), Ernakulam shall be omitted and the following shall be substituted as item No. (2) :

2. Survey Circle, Ernakulam.

This Notification shall take effect from 15-4-83.

[No. 5317 (261/5/83-ITJ)]

शुद्धि पत्र

आयकर

फा० आ० 3056.—बोर्ड की दिनांक 29-1-83 की अधिसूचना सं० 5077 (फा० सं० 261/15/82-आ० क० न्या०) द्वारा यथा संशोधित दिनांक 23-9-82 की अधिसूचना सं० 4923 (फा० सं० 261/15/82-आ० क० न्या०) में, अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त एल-रेंज नई दिल्ली के क्षेत्राधिकार के सामने अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 में क्र० सं० 11 में निम्नलिखित प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा

“जिला VI के सभी बोर्ड”

और अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 के अंतर्गत क्र० सं० 12 पर अ० सं० आयुक्त एम० रेंज नई दिल्ली के क्षेत्राधिकार के

सामने निम्नलिखित को मद (VI) के रूप में जोड़ा जाएगा :—

(VI) विशेष परिमंडल (VIII) तथा VIII (अतिरिक्त)

यह 1-10-1982 से लागू होगा।

[सं० 5318 (फा० सं० 261/15/82-आ० क० न्या०)]

CORRIGENDUM

(Income-tax)

S.O. 3056.—In the Board's Notification No. 4923 (F. No. 261/15/82-ITJ) dated 23-9-82 as amended by Notification No. 5077 dated 29-1-83 (F. No. 261/15/82-ITJ) under Col. 2 of the Schedule at S. No. 11 against Jurisdiction of AAC, L-Range, New Delhi, the following shall be substituted :

“All Wards of Distt. VI.”

And at S. No. 12 under Col. 2 of the Schedule against the jurisdiction of the AAC, M-Range, New Delhi, the following shall be added as item (vi) :

(vi) Special Circle-VIII & VIII (Addl.).

This will be effective from 1-10-1982.

[No. 5318 (F. No. 261/15/82-ITJ)]

फा० आ० 3057.—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 121-क की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा दिनांक 16-11-1982 की अधिसूचना सं० 4968 (फा० सं० 261/34/82 आ० क० न्या०) में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है।

— उक्त अनुसूची के कालम (2) के अंतर्गत आयकर आयुक्त (अपील) जालंधर के सामने मद सं० 5 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा :—

“आयकर आयुक्त (जांच) लुधियाना के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण में सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल I और II जालंधर और जांच परिमंडल, जालंधर सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल फगवाड़ा सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल I, II और III, लुधियाना और जांच परिमंडल, लुधियाना हैं।”

यह अधिसूचना 15-10-1982 से लागू होगी।

[सं० 5319 (फा० सं० 261/1/83 आ० क० न्या०)]

S.O. 3057.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 121-A of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following amendment to its Notification No. 4968 (F. No. 261/34/82-ITJ) dated 16-11-1982.

Under Column (2) of the said schedule against Commissioner of Income-tax (Appeals), Jullundur, item No. 5 shall be substituted with the following :

“5. Survey Circle I & II, Jullundur and Investigation Circles, Jullundur, Survey Circle, Phagwara, Survey Circles I, II and III, Ludhiana and Investigation Circle Ludhiana within the administrative Control of CIT (Inv.), Ludhiana.”

This notification shall take effect from 15-10-1982.

[No. 5319 (F. No. 261/1/83-ITJ)]

का० भा० 3058:—बोर्ड की दिनांक 12-11-80 की अधिसूचना सं० 3736 (फा० सं० 261/33/80-आ० क० न्या०) में अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 2 के अंतर्गत अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, त्रिवेन्द्रम के क्षेत्राधिकार के सामने निम्नलिखित को मद सं० 8 के रूप में जोड़ा जाएगा:—

“सं० 8 आ० का० सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल-II, एर्णाकुलम”

और स्तम्भ 2 के अंतर्गत मद सं० 5 में अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, एर्णाकुलम के क्षेत्राधिकार के सामने निम्नलिखित को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाएगा,

“सं० 5 आ० क० सर्वेक्षण परिमंडल I, एर्णाकुलम।”

यह अधिसूचना 2-8-1982 से प्रभावी होगी।

[सं० 5320 (फा० सं० 261/8/83-आ० क० न्या०)]

S.O. 3058.—In the Board's notification No. 3736 (F. No. 261/33/80-ITJ) dated 12-11-80, under Col. 2 of the Schedule against the jurisdiction of A.A.C., Trivandrum the following shall be added as item No. 8.

“No. 8 I.T. Survey Circle-II, Ernakulam”

And Item No. 5 under Col. 2 against the jurisdiction of A.A.C. Ernakulam shall be substituted with the following:—

“No. 5 I.T. Survey Circle-I, Ernakulam”

This notification shall take effect from 2-8-1982.

[No. 5320 (F. No. 261/8/83-ITJ)]

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1983

आयकर

का० भा० 3059 :—आयकर अधिनियम 1961 (1961 का 43) की धारा 122 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए तथा इस विषय की पिछले अधिसूचनाओं का अधिलेखन करते हुए, केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड एतद्वारा निदेश देता है कि निम्नलिखित अनुसूची के स्तम्भ (2) में विनिर्दिष्ट रेंजों के अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त आयुक्त आयुक्त से निर्धारित उन सभी व्यक्तियों और आय को छोड़कर जिन पर अधिकारिता आयुक्त आयुक्त (अपील) में निहित है, अनुसूची के स्तम्भ 3 की तत्संबंधी प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट आयकर परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों में आयकर से निर्धारित सभी व्यक्तियों और आय के संबंध में अपन कार्य का निर्वहन करेंगे:—

अनुसूची

क्र० सं०	रेंज	आयकर परिमंडल/वार्ड/जिले
1	2	3
1.	अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, पटियाला रेंज, पटियाला	सभी आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिले जिनका मुख्यालय निम्नलिखित स्थानों पर है:— (i) खन्ना (ii) बरनाला (iii) पटियाला (iv) रोपड़

1	2	3
		(v) संगरूर (vi) मालेरकोटला (vii) मण्डी और (vii) पालमपुर में आयकर परिमंडल चम्बा, कांगड़ा, हमीरपुर तथा जिला उना।
2.	अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, लुधियाना रेंज, लुधियाना	सभी आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिले जिनका मुख्यालय लुधियाना में है।
3.	अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त, चण्डीगढ़ रेंज, चण्डीगढ़।	सभी आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिले जिनका मुख्यालय निम्नलिखित स्थानों पर है:— (i) चण्डीगढ़ (ii) शिमला (iii) मोलन

बशर्ते कि उन वार्डों, जिलों और परिमंडलों के संबंध में क्षेत्राधिकार, जो समाप्त किये जा चुके हैं, अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के पास ही रहेंगे जो परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों पर वर्तमान क्षेत्राधिकार रखते हैं, उनके पास इन परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों के मामलों का वर्तमान में कर-निर्धारण किया जाता है।

जहां कोई आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड और जिला या उसका कोई भाग इस अधिसूचना द्वारा एक रेंज से किसी अन्य रेंज में अंतरित कर दिया जाता है वहां उस आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिले या उसके किसी भाग में किये गये कर-निर्धारणों से उत्पन्न होने वाली और इस अधिसूचना की तारीख से तत्काल पूर्व उस अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के समक्ष विचाराधीन पड़ी अपीलें, जिसके अधिकार क्षेत्र से उस आयकर परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिला अथवा उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो, इस अधिसूचना के लागू होने की तारीख से रेंज के उस अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त को अंतरित की जायेंगी और उसके द्वारा उन पर कार्यवाही की जायेंगी, जिसके अधिकार क्षेत्र में उक्त परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिला या उसका कोई भाग अंतरित किया गया हो।

जहां सभी परिमंडल, वार्ड या जिले जिनका मुख्यालय किसी विशिष्ट स्थान पर है, किसी एक अपीलीय सहायक आयुक्त के सुपुर्द किए गये हों, वहां उन मुख्यालयों के परिमंडलों, वार्डों और जिलों के संबंध में भी उन्हीं का क्षेत्राधिकार होगा जो अब समाप्त भी हो चुके हों।

यह अधिसूचना 15-7-1983 से लागू होगी।

सं० 5322 (फा० सं० 261/16/82-आ० क० न्या०)]
के० एम० सुल्तान, अवर सचिव
केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1983

(INCOME-TAX)

S.O. 3059:—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 122 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and in supersession of all the previous notifications in this behalf, the Central Board of Direct Taxes, hereby direct that Appellate Assistant Commissioners of Incometax and the Ranges specified in Column 2 of the Schedule below, shall perform their function in respect of all persons and incomes assessed to income tax in the Income tax Circles, Wards and Districts specified in the corresponding entry in column 3 thereof excluding all persons and incomes assessed to Income tax over which the jurisdiction vests in Commissioners of Income tax (A):—

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Range	Incometax	Circles/Wards/Districts
1	2		3
1.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, Patiala Range, Patiala.	All Incometax and districts having headquarters at (i) Khanna (ii) Barnala (iii) Patiala (iv) Ropar (v) Sangrur (vi) Malerkotla (vii) Mandi and (viii) I-Tax Circle Chamba, Kangra, Hamirpur & Una Distt. at Palampur.	Circles, Wards and Districts
2.	Appellate Asstt. Commissioner, Ludhiana Range, Ludhiana	All Income tax	Circles, Ward Districts having headquarter at Ludhiana
3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner, Chandigarh Range, Chandigarh.	All Income	Circles, Wards and Districts having headquarters at (i) Chandigarh (ii) Simla (iii) Solan

(Provided that jurisdiction in respect of wards, Districts and Circles which have been abolished would also lie with the AACs who have present jurisdiction over Circles, Wards and Districts with whom the cases of these circles Wards and Districts are presently assessed).

Where the Income-tax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof stands transferred by this notification from one Range to another Range, appeals arising out of the assessment made in that Incometax Circle, Ward or district of part thereof and pending immediately before the date of this Notification before the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range from whom the Incometax Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred shall from the date this notification takes effect be transferred to and dealt with by the Appellate Assistant Commissioner of the Range to whom the said Circle, Ward or District or part thereof is transferred.

Where all Circles, Ward and Districts having Headquarters at a particular place have been assigned to an Appellate Assistant

Commissioner, he shall have jurisdiction in respect of Circles, Wards and Districts at these headquarters since abolished also.

This notification shall take effect from 15-7-1983.

[No. 5322 (F. No. 261/16/82-ITJ)]

K. M. SULTAN, Under Secy.
Central Board of Direct Taxes.

(राजस्व विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 16 जुलाई, 1983

प्रधान कार्यालय संस्थापन

का० आ० 3060:— केन्द्रीय राजस्व बोर्ड अधिनियम 1963 (1963 की संख्या 54) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारतीय राजस्व सेवा (आयकर) के अधिकारी श्री ए० आर० नटराजन को जो पिछले दिनों बंगलौर में आयकर आयुक्त कर्नाटक-1 के पद पर तैनात थे 1 जुलाई, 1983 के पूर्वार्ध से केन्द्रीय प्रत्यक्ष कर बोर्ड के सदस्य के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[फा० सं० ए० 19011/14/83-प्रशा०-1]

जी० एस० मेहरा, अवर सचिव

(Department of Revenue)

New Delhi, the 16th July, 1983

HEADQUARTERS ESTABLISHMENT

S.O. 3060:—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 3 of the Central Boards of Revenue Act, 1963 (No. 54 of 1963), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. R. Natarajan, an officer of the Indian Revenue Service (Income-tax) and lately posted as Commissioner of Income-tax, Karnataka-I, Bangalore as Member of the Central Board of Direct Taxes with effect from the forenoon of the 1st July, 1983.

[F. No. A. 19011/14/83-Ad. 1]

G. S. MEHRA, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 जुलाई, 1983

का. आ. 3061:—भारत सरकार के अपर सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सक्षम किया गया है, उक्त उप-धारा के अधीन आदेश सं. 673/2/82-सी.शु.8, तारीख 30 जनवरी, 1982 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि ग्राम गौसियापुर, बागडोगरा, जिला दार्जिलिंग, पश्चिमी बंगाल के स्वर्गीय रमेशचन्द्र सरकार के पुत्र श्री विश्वनाथ सरकार उर्फ बिशु को तस्करी माल के परिवहन करने और तस्करी माल के परिवहन या छिपाने या रखने का काम करने से अन्यथा तस्करी माल का व्यवहार करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से प्रोसिडेसी जेल, कलकत्ता में निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए; और

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिससे उस आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सकता है;

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति, इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर, पुलिस महानिरीक्षक, पश्चिमी बंगाल, कलकत्ता के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[फा. सं. 673/2/82-सीमा-शुल्क-8]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th July, 1983

S.O. 3061.—Whereas the Additional Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/2/82-Cus. VIII dated 30th January, 1982 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Biswanath Sarkar alias Bishu S/o late Ranesh Chandra Sarkar, Village Gonsiapur, Bagdogra, district Darjeeling, West Bengal be detained and kept in Custody in the Presidency Jail, Calcutta with a view to preventing him from transporting smuggled goods and with a view to preventing him from transporting smuggled goods and dealing in smuggled goods otherwise than by engaging in transporting or concealing or keeping smuggled goods; and

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Inspector General of Police, West Bengal, Calcutta within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/2/82-Cus.VIII]

आदेश

का. आ. 3062 :—भारत सरकार के अपर सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश फा. सं. 673/4/82-सी. शृ. 8, तारीख 17 मार्च, 1982 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि ग्राम कोहारका डाकघर स्वाईपर, पुलिस थाना मरायली, जिला अमृतसर के श्री सभा सिंह के पुत्र श्री सतनाम सिंह को तस्करीत माल के परिवहन और छिपाने का काम करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से केन्द्रीय कारागार, अमृतसर में निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए; और

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए; और

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति, इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर पुलिस महानिरीक्षक, पंजाब, जलंधीगढ़ के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[फा. सं. 673/4/82-सी. शृ. 8]

ORDER

S.O. 3062.—Whereas the Additional Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/4/82-Cus.VIII, dated 17th March, 1982 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Satnam Singh S/o Shri Subha Singh of village Koharka, P.O. Subalpur P.S. Sariali Distt. Amritsar be detained and kept in custody in the Central Prison, Amritsar with a view to preventing him from engaging in transporting and concealing smuggled goods; and

2 Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Inspector General of Police, Punjab, Chandigarh within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/4/82-Cus.VIII]

आदेश

का. आ. 3063 :—भारत सरकार के अपर सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश फा. सं. 673/5/82-सी. शृ. 8, तारीख 22 फरवरी, 1982 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि 152, रामनगर, दिल्ली-110051 के श्री ओम प्रकाश वर्मा के पुत्र श्री सनील कुमार वर्मा उर्फ ललित कुमार को माल की तस्करी करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से, केन्द्रीय जेल नई दिल्ली में निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए; और

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिसे उस आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सकता है;

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रवृत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति, इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर पुलिस आयुक्त, नई दिल्ली के समक्ष हाजिर हो।

[फा. सं. 673/5/82-सी. शृ. 8]

ORDER

S.O. 3063.—Whereas the Additional Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/5/82-Cus.VIII, dated the 22nd February, 1982, under the said sub-section directing that Shri Sunil Kumar Verma alias Lalit Kumar, son of Shri Om Prakash Verma, of 152, Ram Nagar, Delhi-110051 be detained and kept in custody in the Central Jail, New Delhi, with a view to preventing him from smuggling goods; and

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, New Delhi, within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/5/82-Cus.VIII]

आदेश

का. बा. 3084 :—भारत सरकार के अपर सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश फा. सं. 673/6/82-सी. शु. 8 तारीख 22 फरवरी, 1982 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि 2055, महावीर गली सदर बाजार, दिल्ली के श्री श्याम नन्दन के पुत्र श्री देवेन्द्र कुमार उर्फ देवेन्द्र कुमार वर्मा को माल की तस्करी करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से, केन्द्रीय जेल, नई दिल्ली में निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ; और

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिससे उस आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सकता है ;

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति, इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर पुलिस आयुक्त दिल्ली के समक्ष हाजिर हो ।

[फा. सं. 673/6/82-सी. शु. 8]

ORDER

S.O. 3064.—Whereas the Additional Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/6/82-Cus.VIII dated 22nd February, 1982 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Devender Kumar alias Devender Kumar Verma S/o Shri Shyam Nandan of 2055, Mahavir Gali, Sadar Bazar, Delhi be detained and kept in custody in the Central Jail, New Delhi with a view to preventing him from smuggling goods; and

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Commissioner of Police, Delhi within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/6/82-Cus.VIII]

आदेश

का. बा. 3065 :—भारत सरकार के अपर सचिव ने, जिसे विदेशी मुद्रा संरक्षण और तस्करी निवारण अधिनियम, 1974 (1974 का 52) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन विशेष रूप से सशक्त किया गया है, उक्त उपधारा के अधीन आदेश फा. सं. 673/25/82-सी. शु. 8 तारीख 10 सितम्बर, 1982 यह निदेश देते हुए जारी किया था कि सेवोक रोड, होल्डिंग सं. 661, वाड सं. 6, डाकघर सिलिगुड़ी, जिला दार्जिलिंग, पश्चिमी बंगाल के श्री जगन्नाथ गुप्ता उर्फ मंगल चन्द गुप्ता के पुत्र श्री रमेश गुप्ता उर्फ रमेश कुमार गुप्ता को तस्करीत माल के परिवहन का काम करने से निवारित करने की दृष्टि से प्रेसिडेन्सी जेल, कलकत्ता में निरुद्ध कर लिया जाए और अभिरक्षा में रखा जाए ; और

2. केन्द्रीय सरकार के पास यह विश्वास करने का कारण है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति फरार हो गया है या अपने को छिपा रहा है जिससे उस आदेश का निष्पादन नहीं हो सकता है ;

3. अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, यह निदेश देती है कि पूर्वोक्त व्यक्ति, इस आदेश के राजपत्र में प्रकाशन के सात दिन के भीतर पुलिस महानिरीक्षक, पश्चिम बंगाल, कलकत्ता के समक्ष हाजिर हो ।

[फा. सं. 673/25/82-सी. शु. 8]

आर. मुखोपाध्याय, उप सचिव

ORDER

S.O. 3065.—Whereas the Additional Secretary to the Government of India, specially empowered under sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Conservation of Foreign Exchange and Prevention of Smuggling Activities Act, 1974 (52 of 1974) issued order F. No. 673/25/82-Cus.VIII dated 10th September, 1982 under the said sub-section directing that Shri Ramesh Gupta alias Ramesh Kumar Gupta, S/o Shri Jagannath Gupta alias Mangal Chand Gupta Sevok Road, Holding Nq. 661, Ward No. 6, P.O. Siliguri, District Darjeeling, West Bengal be detained and kept in custody in the Presidency Jail, Calcutta with a view to preventing him from engaging in transporting smuggled goods; and

2. Whereas the Central Government has reason to believe that the aforesaid person has absconded or is concealing himself so that the order cannot be executed;

3. Now, therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs the aforesaid person to appear before the Inspector General of Police, West Bengal, Calcutta within 7 days of the publication of this order in the official Gazette.

[F. No. 673/25/82-Cus.VIII]

R. MUKHOPADHYAY, Dy. Secy.

भारतीय रिजर्व बैंक

(ग्रामीण आयोजना और ऋण विभाग)

केन्द्रीय कार्यालय

मुम्बई-पत्र

वम्बई, 30 अप्रैल, 1983

का०आ० 3066.—18 जनवरी, 1983 के भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र के भाग 2 खंड 3(ii) में एस० ओ० 25 (ई) के अंतर्गत प्रकाशित 18 जनवरी, 1983 की राजपत्र अधिसूचना आर० पी० सी० डी० सं० 249/आई एन सी एल/311-83 में छपे शब्दों "विदूर ग्रामीण बैंक" बिजनौर के स्थान पर "विदूर ग्रामीण बैंक" बिजनौर शब्द पढ़े जायें।

[एफ० 1-21/82-आर आर बी]

एच० बी० शिवमग्गी, कार्यपालक निदेशक

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

(Rural Planning and Credit Department)

CENTRAL OFFICE

CORRIGENDUM

Bombay, the 30th April, 1983

S.O. 3066.—For the words "Bidur Gramin Bank", Bijnor appearing in Gazette notification RPCD, No. 249/INCL/311-83 dated 18th January, 1983 published under S.O. 25(E) published in Part II—Section 3 (ii) of the Gazette of India Extraordinary dated 18th January, 1983 the words "Vidur Gramin Bank", Bijnor may be substituted.

[F. No. 1-21/82-RRB]

H. B. SHIVAMAGGI, Executive Director

आर्थिक कार्य विभाग

(बैंकिंग प्रभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3067 —भारतीय स्टेट बैंक (अनुषंगी बैंक) अधिनियम, 1959 (1959 का 38) की धारा 26 की उपधारा (2क) के साथ पठित धारा 25 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (गक) के अनुसरण में केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा स्टेट बैंक आफ मैसूर प्रधान कार्यालय बंगलौर के प्रधान लिपिक श्री ए० बी० अम्बा प्रसाद को जो कि कर्मकार है स्टेट बैंक आफ मैसूर के कर्मचारियों में से 22 जुलाई, 1983 से प्रारम्भ होने वाली और 21 जुलाई, 1986 को समाप्त होने वाली तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत सरकार, वित्त मंत्रालय, आर्थिक कार्य विभाग (बैंकिंग प्रभाग) की तारीख 31 मार्च, 1978 की अधिसूचना संख्या एफ० 8/15/78-बी० ओ० 1 (3) के अंतर्गत नियुक्त श्री एन० जगन्नाथन के स्थान पर स्टेट बैंक आफ मैसूर के बीई में निदेशक नियुक्त करना है।

[सं० एफ० 8/3/83-बी०ओ० 1]

च० वा० मीरचन्दानी, उप सचिव

(Department of Economic Affairs)

(Banking Division)

New Delhi, the 20th July, 1983

S.O. 3067.—In pursuance of clause (ca) of sub-section (1) of section 25 read with sub-section (2A) of section 26 of the State Bank of India (Subsidiary Banks) Act, 1959 (38 of 1959), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. B. Ambaprasad, Head Clerk, State Bank of Mysore, Head Office Bangalore as a director on the Board of the State Bank of Mysore from among the employees of the State Bank of Mysore who are workmen for a period of three years commencing on 22nd July, 1983 and ending with 21st July, 1986 in the place of Shri N. Jagannathan appointed under the Notification of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs (Banking Division).

[No. F. 8/3/83-BO. II]

C. W. MIRCHANDANI, Dy. Secy.

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क समाहर्त लिप्य : कलकत्ता

केन्द्रीय उत्पाद शुल्क

अधिसूचना सं० 3/के० 30/1983

कलकत्ता, 24 जून, 1983

का० आ० 3068.—केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क निःस्माद्वर्ती, 1944 के नियम 5 द्वारा मुद्रित प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए मैं श्री नरेन्द्र कुमार बाजपेयी, समाहर्ता, केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क, कलकत्ता, इनके द्वारा केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क निःस्माद्वर्ती, 1944, नियम 56 ग उपनिषय (1) के द्वितीय परन्तुक, तृतीय परन्तुक और चतुर्थ परन्तुक के अर्थात् समाहर्ता की शक्तियों को केन्द्रीय उत्पाद-शुल्क कलकत्ता के सहायक समाहर्ताओं को अपने अधिकार क्षेत्रों में प्रयोग करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करना है।

[सी० सं० IV (8)1-के० 30/82]

नरेन्द्र कुमार बाजपेयी, समाहर्ता

COLLECTORATE OF CENTRAL EXCISE : CALCUTTA

CENTRAL EXCISE

NOTIFICATION NO. 3/CE/1983

Calcutta the 24th June, 1983

S.O. 3068.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me by rule 5 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I, Shri N. K. Bajpai, Collector, Central Excise Calcutta hereby authorise the Assistant Collectors of Central Excise, Calcutta to exercise the powers of Collector under the second proviso, the third proviso and the fourth proviso to sub-rule (1) of Rule 56-C of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 in their respective jurisdictions.

[C. No. IV(8)1-CE/82]

N. K. BAJPAI, Collector.

वाणिज्य मन्त्रालय

(संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक आयात तथा निर्यात का कार्यालय, मद्रास)

आदेश

मद्रास, 25 जून, 1983

विषय :—आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 के धारा 9(1)(ए) के अंतर्गत अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस संख्या पीवी-0356488-सी-एक्स-84-एम-81/0.1 दिनांक 15-9-82 की रद्दीकरण

का०आ० 3069—सर्वश्री ट्रांसवर्ल्ड ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड, 35 माउण्ट रोड, मद्रास-2 को अप्रैल-मार्च 1983 अवधि के लिए रुपये 14,38,906 तक अप्रैल-मार्च, 1983 आयात नीति के पैरा 186 में दर्शाई गई अनुमति मदों का आयात करने के लिए अतिरिक्त आयात लाइसेंस संख्या पीवी-0356488-सी-एक्स-84-एम-81/0.1 दिनांक 15-9-82 जारी किया गया था। यह लाइसेंस 1981-82 के दौरान किये गये निर्यात के तथा उनको लघु पैमाने एककों की कन्सर्टेयम के आधार पर जारी किये गये नियति सदन प्रमाण पत्र के मद्दे जारी किया गया था।

उसके बाद वे संप्रमाण पत्रों के सहित नियति दस्तावेजों की जांच करने से पता चला कि वे सभी निर्यात, जिनके मद्दे अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस का दावा किया गया था, सदस्य एकक के वैयक्तिक नाम पर ही किये गये थे और उसके अनुसार नैर्वासक रूप से आर०ई०पी० लाइसेंस भी प्राप्त किया गया था। दस्तावेज भी कन्सर्टेयम के नाम पर नहीं है। अतः यह स्पष्ट है कि उन्होंने तथ्यों की मिथ्याख्यापन और मिथ्या दावा करके अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस प्राप्त किया है। आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 के धारासंशोधन धारा 9(1)(ए) के अंतर्गत आवेदक को यह पृष्ठने हुए कि उपर्युक्त अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस को क्यों न रद्द कर दिया जाये कारण प्रतीति नोटिस संख्या अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस-16-81/82-एम/83 आरईपी-4 दिनांक 27-5-83 जारी किया गया था। अपने मामलों को स्पष्ट करने, आवेदक को वैयक्तिक सुनवाई के लिए भी 8-6-83 को 11-00 बजे तक अवकाश दिया गया था। कारण बताओ नोटिस के दिनांक से 10 दिन के भीतर ही उत्तर भेजा था।

न तो इस प्रकार में उपलब्ध दस्तावेजों में और न तो आवेदक से प्रस्तुत किये गये गवाही और स्पष्टीकरणों से यह स्पष्ट हुआ कि उनसे किये गये निर्यात जिनके मद्दे अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस जारी करने के लिए दावा किया गया था, कन्सर्टेयम के नाम पर है। यह भी स्पष्ट है कि उन्होंने तथ्यों की मिथ्या-ख्यापन करके अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस प्राप्त किया है।

पहले जो कुछ कहा जा चुका है उसे देखते हुए अवोहस्ताक्षरी आयात (नियंत्रण) आदेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की यथा संशोधित धारा 9(1)(ए) के अंतर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए, सर्वश्री

ट्रांसवर्ल्ड ट्रेडिंग कम्पनी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड 35, माउण्ट रोड मद्रास-600002 को जारी किये गये अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस संख्या पीवी-0356488-सी-एक्स-84-एम-81/0.1 दिनांक 15-9-82 को पत्रद्वारा रद्द करना है।

[सं० अतिरिक्त लाइसेंस-16/81-82-एम 83 आरईपी-4]

एम० नरसिम्हन्, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक

आयात तथा निर्यात

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Office of the Joint Chief Controller of Imports and Exports, Madras)

CANCELLATION ORDER

Madras, the 25th June, 1983

Sub :—Cancellation of Additional Licence No. P[0356488] C[XX][84]M[81]0.1 dated 15-9-82—under Clause 9(1)(a) of Imports (Control) Order, 1955.

S.O. 3069.—An Additional licence No. PV/0356488/C/XX/84[M]81/0.1 dated 15-9-82 for Rs. 14,38,906 for import of items permissible as per para 186 of AM'83 Policy was issued to M/s. Transworld Trading Co. Pvt. Ltd., 35, Mount Road, Madras-2 for the licensing period April-March, 83 against exports effected during 1981-82 and Export House Certificate issued to them as a consortium of SSI Units.

2. Thereafter on verification of export documents including Bank Certificates it was found that all exports claimed stand in the name of the individual member units only and regular REP licence have been obtained accordingly. The documents are also not in the name of Consortium. Thus it was clear that they had obtained the Additional licence by misrepresentation of facts and false claims.

3. A Show Cause Notice No. Addl. Licence 16/81-82/AM83/REP-IV dated 27-5-83 was issued to the firm asking them to show cause within 10 days as to why the aforesaid Additional licence issued in their favour should not be cancelled in terms of Clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order 1955. A personal hearing also was offered to the firm on 8-6-83 at 11.00 A.M.

4. Neither documents already available in this office nor evidence/explanation offered by the firm proved that exports effected by them and claimed by them for issue of Additional licences stand in the name of Consortium. It was also clear that they had obtained the Additional licence by misrepresentation of facts.

5. Having regard to what has been stated above, the undersigned in exercise of the powers vested in him under clause 9(1)(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955 amended till date hereby cancel the above cited Additional Lic. No. PV/0356488/C/XX[84]M[81]0.1 dated 15-9-82 issued in favour of M/s. Transworld Trading Co. Pvt. Ltd., 35- Mount Road, Madras-600002.

[No. Addl. Lic. 16/81-82/AM'83/REP.—IV]

S. NARASIMHAN, Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports

वस्त्र विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 3070.—केन्द्रीय सरकार केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 61) की धारा 3 की उप-धारा (3) के खण्ड (क) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, श्री बी० शिवरमन आई० सी० एस० (सेवानिवृत्त) को केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड का 8 अप्रैल, 1983 तक अध्यक्ष

नियुक्त करती है और भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय (वस्त्र विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 2234, तारीख 24 अप्रैल, 1982 का निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है अर्थात्—

उक्त अधिसूचना में "सदस्य" प्रविष्टि से पहले निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि अंतःस्थापित की जाएगी, अर्थात् :—

"अध्यक्ष

श्री बी० शिवरामन, आई०सी०एस० (सेवानिवृत्त)"

[सं० 25012/11/82 रेशम खण्ड-II]

(Department of Textiles)

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1983

S.O. 3070.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Clause (a) of sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri B. Sivaraman, ICS (Retired), as Chairman of the Central Silk Board upto the 8th April, 1985, and hereby makes the following further amendment in the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce (Department of Textile) No. S.O. 2234 dated the 24th April, 1982, namely :—

In the said Notification, before the entry "Members", the following entry shall be inserted namely :—

"Chairman
Shri B. Sivaraman, ICS (Retired)".

[F. No. 25012/11/82-Silk Vol-III]

का० आ० 3071 :—केन्द्रीय रेशम बोर्ड अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 61) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के वाणिज्य मंत्रालय (वस्त्र विभाग) की अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 1909, तारीख 8 अप्रैल, 1983 द्वारा यथा संशोधित अधिसूचना का० आ० सं० 2234 तारीख 24 अप्रैल, 1982 का निम्नलिखित संशोधन करता है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में मद 31 और उससे संबंधित प्रविष्टि के पश्चात् निम्नलिखित अंतःस्थापित किया जाएगा, अर्थात्—

"32. श्री श्रीनाथ
मैसर्स नाथ ब्रादर्स,
एक्सिम इन्टरनेशनल लिमिटेड,
नई दिल्ली।

} अधिनियम की धारा 4(3)
{ (अ) के अधीन केन्द्रीय
{ सरकार द्वारा नामनिर्दि-
{ शित।"

[फा० सं० 25012/11/82 रेशम खण्ड-I]

क० चौधुरी, उप सचिव

S.O. 3071.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce (Department of Textiles) S.O. No. 2234, dated the 24th April, 1982 as amended by the notification S.O. No. 1909, dated 8th April, 1983, namely :—

In the said notification, after item 31 and the entry relating thereto, the following shall be inserted, namely :—

"32. Shri Srinath
M/s. Nath Bros.,
Exim International Ltd.
New Delhi

} Nominated by the
{ Central Government
{ under section 4(3)(j)
{ of the Act."

[F. No. 25012/11/82-Silk Vol-I]

K. CHAUDHURI, Dy. Secy.

उद्योग मंत्रालय

(औद्योगिक विकास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3072.—केन्द्रीय सरकार, राजभाषा (संघ के शासकीय प्रयोजनों के लिए प्रयोग) नियम, 1976 के नियम 10 के उपनियम (4) के अनुसरण में निम्नलिखित कार्यालयों को जिनके कर्मचारी बृन्द ने हिन्दी का कार्यसाधक ज्ञान प्राप्त कर लिया है, अधिसूचित करती है :—

1. राष्ट्रीय उत्पादकता परिषद्, नई दिल्ली।
2. इन्स्टीट्यूट फॉर डिजाइन आफ इलेक्ट्रिकल मेजरिंग इन्स्ट्रुमेंट्स, बम्बई।
3. नमक अधीक्षक का कार्यालय, जोधपुर।
4. दि नेशनल इण्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड, नई दिल्ली।
5. ट्रेड मार्क्स रजिस्ट्री, बंबई।
6. टैनरी एंड फुटवियर कारपोरेशन आफ इंडिया लिमिटेड, कानपुर।
7. दि नेशनल न्यूज प्रिंट एंड पेपर मिन्स लिमिटेड, नेपा नगर (म० प्र०)।
8. खादी और ग्रामोद्योग आयोग, राज्य कार्यालय, अहमदाबाद।
9. खादी और ग्रामोद्योग आयोग, राज्य कार्यालय, बम्बई।

[संख्या ई०-12012/2/82-हि० अ०]

प्रमोद चन्द्र रावल, उप सचिव

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY

(Department of Industrial Development)

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3072.—In pursuance of sub-rule (4) of rule 10 of the Official Language (Use for official purposes of the Union) Rules, 1976, the Central Government hereby notifies the following offices whose staff have acquired the working knowledge of Hindi :—

1. National Productivity Council, New Delhi.
2. Institute for Design of Electrical Measuring Instruments, Bombay.
3. Office of the Superintendent of Salt, Jodhpur.
4. The National Industrial Development Corporation Limited, New Delhi.

5. Trade Marks Registry, Bombay.
6. Tannery and Footwear Corporation of India Limited, Kanpur.
7. The National Newsprint and Paper Mills Limited, Nepa Nagar (M.P.)
8. State Office, Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Ahmedabad.
9. State Office, Khadi and Village Industries Commission, Bombay.

[No. E-12012/2/82-H.S.]

P. C. RAWAL, Dy. Secy.

(भारी उद्योग विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3073.—उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवं विकास परिषद् (कार्यविधिक) नियम, 1952 के नियम 2, 4 और 5 के साथ पढ़ते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा अध्यक्ष, भारतीय इंजीनियरी उद्योग संघ को भारत सरकार, उद्योग मंत्रालय (भारी उद्योग विभाग) के आदेश सं० का० आ० 745(ड) दिनांक 14 अक्टूबर, 1981 जिसे आदेश सं० का० आ० 2507 दिनांक 23-6-82 द्वारा संशोधित किया गया है, द्वारा गठित की गई मशीनी औजारों के निर्माण अथवा उत्पादनरत अनुसूचित उद्योगों की विकास परिषद् का सदस्य नियुक्त करती है और यह निदेश देती है कि उक्त आदेश में निम्नलिखित संशोधन किये जायेंगे अर्थात्:—

उक्त आदेश में क्रम संख्या 14 के सामने दी गई प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित प्रविष्टि रखी जाएगी, अर्थात्:—

“14. अध्यक्ष,

भारतीय इंजीनियरी उद्योग संघ,

172, जोर बाग,

नई दिल्ली-110003”

[सं० 19-7/81-एम०टी०]

शोभन कानूनगो, संयुक्त सचिव

(Department of Heavy Industry)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3973.—In exercise of powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with Rules 2, 4 & 5 of the Development Council (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints President, Association of Indian Engineering Industry, to be a member of the Development Council constituted by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industry (Department of Heavy Industry) No. S. O. 745(E) dated the 14th October, 1981 as amended vide Order

No. S.O. 2507 dated 23-6-1982 for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Machine Tools and direct that the following amendments shall be made in the said order namely:—

In the said order for the entry occurring against serial number 14, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“14. President,
Association of Indian Engineering Industry,

172, Jor Bagh,
New Delhi-110003.”

[No. 19-7/81-MTI]

S. KANUNGO, Jt. Secy.

इस्पत और खान मंत्रालय
(खान विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1983

का० आ० 3074.—यतः केन्द्र सरकार की राय में भारत में खनिजों के संरक्षण और विकास के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि निम्नलिखित सारणी के कालम (2) में उल्लिखित पट्टाधारी क्षेत्रों में या उसके अंतर्गत उपलब्ध किसी खनिज के बारे में यथासंभव सही जानकारी एकत्र की जाए:

तथा यतः उक्त क्षेत्रों के संबंध में खनन पट्टे कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार द्वारा मंजूर किए गए हैं।

अतः अब खान और खनिज (विनियमन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 67) की धारा 18ए की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्र सरकार कर्नाटक राज्य सरकार के परामर्श से जैसा कि उक्त धारा 18ए की उपधारा (1) के परन्तुक में अपेक्षित है भारतीय भूवैज्ञानिक सर्वेक्षण को उक्त सारणी में उल्लिखित क्षेत्रों में ऐसी जानकारी जो आवश्यक हो, प्राप्त करने के उद्देश्य से व्यापक अन्वेषण कार्य किए जाने के लिए एतद्वारा प्राधिकृत करती है।

सारणी

पट्टाधारी का नाम	पट्टाधारी क्षेत्रों का ब्यौरा
1	2
मै० मैसूर मिनरल्स लि० महात्मा गांधी रोड, बंगलौर	कर्नाटक के यलोपुर तालुक में 560 एकड़ क्षेत्र पर 15-5-1969 से 20 वर्ष के लिए खनन पट्टा संख्या 886.

[फा० सं० 11 (72)/80 खान-6]

ए० के० वेंकटसुब्रह्मण्यन, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES

(Department of Mines)

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1983

S.O. 3074:—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that for the conservation and development of minerals in India it is necessary to collect as precise information as possible with regard to any mineral available in or under the leasehold areas specified in Column (2) of the Table below:

And whereas in respect of the said areas, mining leases have been granted by the State Government of Karnataka:

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 18A of the Mines and Minerals (Regulation and Development) Act, 1957 (67 of 1957), the Central Government, after consultation with the State Government of Karnataka as required by the proviso to sub-section (1) of the

said section 18A hereby authorise the Geological Survey of India to carry out such detailed investigations for the purpose of obtaining such information as may be necessary in the areas specified in the said Table.

TABLE

Name of the Lessee	Details of the leasehold areas
1	2
Messrs Mysore Minerals Ltd., Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bangalore.	Mining Lease No. 886 for a period of 20 years from 13-5-69 over an area of 560 acres in Yellopur Taluk of Karnataka.

[File No. 11(72)/80- M-VI]

A. K. VENKATA SUBRAMANIAN, Director

नागरिक पूर्ति मंत्रालय

भारतीय मानक संस्था

नई दिल्ली, 1983-07-11

का०आ० 3075:—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 4 के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त विनियम 3 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार प्राप्त अधिकारों के अधीन अनुसूची में दिए भारतीय मानक में संशोधन जारी किया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम	संशोधित भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या संख्या और शीर्षक	जिस राजपत्र में भारतीय मानक के तैयार होने की सूचना छपी थी उसकी संख्या और तिथि	संशोधित मानक को संख्या और दिनांक	संशोधन का संक्षिप्त विवरण	संशोधन लागू होने की तिथि
------	---	---	----------------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	IS: 2347-1974 घरेलू प्रेशर कुकरों की विशिष्टि (दूसरा पुनरीक्षण)	एसओ 1598 दिनांक 1979-05-19	संख्या 2 जुलाई 1983	(पृष्ठ 4, खण्ड 3.1 पंक्ति 1)--- "4 से 22 लीटर" के स्थान पर "2 से 22 लीटर" कर लीजिए	1983-07-01

[संख्या मो एस डी/13 : 5]

ए. क. वनजी, अपर महा निदेशक

MINISTRY OF CIVIL SUPPLIES

INDIAN STANDARDS INSTITUTION

New Delhi, 1983-07-11

S.O. 3075:—In pursuance of regulation 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that amendment to the Indian Standard given in the schedule hereto annexed has been issued under the powers conferred by the sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 3 of the said Regulations.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No. and title of the No. Indian Standard amended	No. and date of Gazette Notification in which the establishment of the Indian Standard was notified	No. and Date of the Amendment	Brief particulars of the Amendment	Date from which the amendment shall have effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1 IS : 2347 - 1974 Specification for domestic pressure cookers (second revision)	S.O. 1598 dated 1979-05-19	No. 2 July 1983	(Page 4, Clause 3.1, line 1)—Substitute '2 to 22 litres' for '4 to 22 litres'.	1983-07-01

[No. CMD/13 : 5]

A. P. BANERJI, Additional Director General.

ऊर्जा मंत्रालय

कोयला विभाग

नई दिल्ली, 15 जुलै, 1983

का० आ० 3076.—केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, कोयला धारक क्षेत्र (अर्जन और विकास) अधिनियम, 1957 (1957 का 20) की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के अधीन भारत सरकार के भूतत्त्व इस्पान खान और कोयला ऊर्जा मंत्रालय (कोयला विभाग) की अधिसूचना सं० का० आ० 1539, तारीख 31 मार्च 1982 द्वारा उक्त अधिसूचना में संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट परिश्रेत में भूमि का अर्जन करने के अपने आशय की सूचना दी थी;

और संक्षेप प्राधिकारी ने उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 8 के अनुसर्गण में अपनी रिपोर्टें केन्द्रीय सरकार को दे दी हैं.

और केन्द्रीय सरकार का पूर्वोक्त रिपोर्ट पर विचार करने और बिहार सरकार से परामर्श करने के पश्चात्, यह समाधान हो गया है कि इसमें संलग्न अनुसूची में वर्णित 111.50 एकड़ (लगभग) या 45.12 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि का अर्जन किया जाएगा

अतः अत्र केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 9 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियाँ का प्रयोग करते हुए यह घोषणा करती है कि उक्त अनुसूची में वर्णित 111.50 एकड़ (लगभग) या 45.12 हेक्टर (लगभग) माप की भूमि का अर्जन किया जाता है।

इस अधिसूचना के अधीन आने वाले क्षेत्र के रेखांक का निरीक्षण उपआयुक्त हजारी बाग (बिहार) के कार्यालय में या कोयला नियंत्रक 1 काउंसिल हाउस स्ट्रीट, कलकत्ता के कार्यालय में या सेंट्रल कोल्फील्ड लिमिटेड (राजस्व अनुभाग) दरभंगा हाउस, राप्ती (बिहार) के कार्यालय में किया जा सकता है।

अनुसूची

सिक्का कोयला खान विस्तार ब्लॉक IV

दक्षिणी कर्नपुरा कोयला क्षेत्र

जिला हजारीबाग (बिहार)

ड्राइंग सं० राजस्व 147/82

तारीख 17-7-1982

(जिसमें अर्जित की गई भूमि दर्शित की गई है)

सर्वाधिकार :

क्रम सं०	ग्राम	थाना	थाना सं०	जिला	क्षेत्र	टिप्पणियाँ
1	टांगी	मांडू	135	हजारीबाग	111.50	भाग

कुल क्षेत्र 111.50 एकड़ (लगभग)

या 45.12 हेक्टर (लगभग)

टोंगी ग्राम में अजित किण्ण गा. प्लाट संख्यांक.

517 (भाग), 519 से 527, 528 (भाग), 529 से 532, 533 (भाग), 536 (भाग), 539 (भाग), 1027 (भाग) 1044 (भाग), 1045 (भाग), 1046 (भाग), 1047 से 1067, 1068 (भाग), 1069 (भाग)।

सीमा वर्णन :

- क-ख रेखा टोंगी ग्राम से प्लाट संख्यांक 1044, 1045, 1046 और प्लाट संख्यांक 1050 की पश्चिमी सीमा से होकर जाती है (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9(1) के अधीन अजित मिरका कोयला खान विस्तार III की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा बनानी है) और बिन्दु "ख" पर मिलती है।
- ख-ग रेखा टोंगी और मिरका ग्रामों की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ-साथ जाती है (जो कोयला अधिनियम की धारा 9 (1) के अधीन अजित मिरका कोयला खान विस्तार III की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा बनानी है) और बिन्दु "ग" पर मिलती है।
- ग-घ रेखा टोंगी और मिरका ग्रामों की भागतः सम्मिलित सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "घ" पर मिलती है।
- घ-ङ रेखा टोंगी ग्राम में (विद्यमान सड़क की सीमा के साथ साथ) प्लाट संख्यांक 1069 की पश्चिमी सीमा के साथ साथ होती हुई प्लाट संख्यांक 1068 और 1069 से होकर जाती है और बिन्दु "ङ" पर मिलती है।
- ङ-च रेखा टोंगी ग्राम से नाला के भागतः पश्चिमी किनारे के साथ साथ जाती है और बिन्दु "च" पर मिलती है।
- च-क रेखा टोंगी ग्राम में प्लाट संख्यांक 517 से होती हुई प्लाट संख्यांक 519 और 520 की उत्तरी सीमा के साथ-साथ तथा प्लाट संख्यांक 517, 528, 517, 533, 1027, 536, 539, 1027 से होकर और प्लाट संख्यांक 1044 की भागतः उत्तरी सीमा के साथ साथ जाती है और आरम्भिक बिन्दु "क" पर मिलती है।

[सं० 19/60/82-सी० एल०]

समय सिंह, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF ENERGY

(Deptt. of Coal)

New Delhi, the 15th July, 1983

S.O. 3076. - Whereas by the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Energy (Department of Coal) No. S.O. 1539 dated the 31st March, 1982, under sub-section (1) of section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), the Central Government gave notice of its intention to acquire the lands in the locality specified in the Schedule appended to that notification :

And whereas the competent authority, in pursuance of section 8 of the said Act, has made his report to the Central Government:

And whereas the Central Government, after considering the report aforesaid and after consulting the Government of Bihar, is satisfied that the lands measuring 111.50 acres (approximately) or 45.12 hectares (approximately) described in the Schedule appended hereto, should be acquired:

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 9 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby declares that the lands measuring 111.50 acres (approximately) or 45.12 hectares (approximately), described in the said Schedule, are hereby acquired.

The plans of the area covered by this notification may be inspected in the Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Hazaribagh (Bihar) or in the Office of the Coal Controller, 1, Council House Street, Calcutta or in the Office of the Central Coalfields Limited (Revenue Section) Darbhanga House, Ranchi (Bihar).

SCHEDULE

Sirka Colliery Extension Block-IV
South Karanpura Coalfield
District Hazaribagh (Bihar)

Org No. Rev/47/82
Dated 17-7-82
(Showing lands acquired)

All Rights :

Serial number	Village	Thana	Thana number	District	Area	Remarks
1	Tongi	Mandu	135	Hazaribagh	111.50	Part
Total area :- 111.50 acres (approximately) or 45.12 hectares (approximately)						

Plot numbers acquired in village Tongi :-

517(Part), 519 to 527, 528 (Part), 529 to 532, 533(Part), 536(Part), 539(Part), 1027(Part), 1044(Part), 1045(Part), 1046(Part), 1047 to 1067, 1068(Part), 1069(Part).

Boundary description :-

A-B line passes through plot numbers 1044, 1045, 1046 and western boundary of plot number 1050, in village Tongi (which forms part common boundary of Sirka Colliery Extn. III acquired u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act) and meets at point 'B'.

B-C line passes along the part common boundary of villages Tongi and Sirka (which forms part common boundary of Sirka Colliery extension III acquired u/s 9(1) of the Coal Act) and meets at point 'C'.

C-D line passes along the part common boundary of village Tongi and Sirka and meets at point 'D'.

D-E line passes along the Western boundary of plot no. 1069 through plot numbers 1068 and 1069 in village Tongi (along the boundary of existing Road) and meets at point 'E'.

E-F line passes along the part Western bank of Nala in village Tongi and meets at point 'F'.

F-A line passes through plot no. 517 along northern boundary of plot nos. 519 and 520 and through plot numbers 517, 528, 517, 533, 1027, 536, 539, 1027 and along part northern boundary of plot number 1044 in village Tongi and meets at starting point 'A'.

[No. 19/60/82-CL]

SAMAY SINGH, Under Secy.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय

(राष्ट्र विमानन विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 19 जुलाई, 1983

क्र०आ० 3077:—अंतरराष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 43) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (3) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्द्वारा पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मंत्रालय में संयुक्त सचिव श्री जे० एन० कौल को श्री सी०एम० चतुर्वेदी के स्थान पर तत्काल तीन वर्ष की अवधि के लिए भारत अंतरराष्ट्रीय विमानपत्तन प्राधिकरण का अंशकालिक सदस्य नियुक्त करती है।

[ए०वी० 24012/1/83-ए०ए०]

बी०एन० झा, निदेशक

MINISTRY OF TOURISM & CIVIL AVIATION

(Department of Civil Aviation)

New Delhi, the 19th July, 1983

S.O. 3077.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-Section (3) of Section 3 of the International Airports Authority Act, 1971 (43 of 1971), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri J. N. Kaul, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Tourism & Civil Aviation as a part-time Member of the International Airports Authority of India with immediate effect for a period of 3 years, vice Shri C. M. Chaturvedi.

[AV. 24012/1/83-AA]

B. N. JHA, Director

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 6 जुलाई, 1983

आदेश

का० आ० 3078.—भारत सरकार के सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के आदेश संख्या एस० ओ० 3792 दिनांक 2 दिसम्बर, 1966 की प्रथम अनुसूची में निर्धारित प्रत्येक अधिनियम के उपबन्ध के अन्तर्गत जारी किये गये अनुदेशों के अनुसार केन्द्रीय सरकार फिल्म सलाहकार बोर्ड बम्बई की सिफारिशों पर विचार करने के बाद इसके साथ लगी अनुसूची के कालम 2 में दी गई फिल्मों को उनके सभी भारतीय भाषाओं के रूपान्तरों सहित जिनका विवरण प्रत्येक के सामने उक्त अनुसूची के कालम 6 में दिया हुआ है, स्वीकृत करती है :—

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	फिल्म की लम्बाई (मीटरों में)	आवेदक का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	क्या वैज्ञानिक फिल्म है या शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म है या समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म है या डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म है
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	महिती चित्र संख्या 373	263.65	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनार्ड रिसर्च लेबा० लि०, 77 डा० एनी वेंसट रोड, वोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निवेशक, गुजरात सरकार सचिवालय, ब्लॉक नं० 7, गांधीनगर-10.	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
2.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 378	264	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म सेंटर 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म सेंटर, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
3.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 97	282	कैलाश नारायण श्रीवास्तव, मार्फत बम्बई फिल्म लेबोरेट्रीज, 149, आर० बी० एस० के० बोले रोड, बम्बई-28	सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। उत्तर-प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
4.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 98	282	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
5.	कृष्णनन्दम	498.04	अदूर गोपालकृष्णन हरसामम, त्रिवेन्द्रम-695017		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
6.	प्रिकारियस जर्नी	105	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-400026		शिक्षा संबंधी फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
7.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 99	282	कैलाश नायायण श्रीवास्तव मार्फत फिल्म लेबोरेट्रीज, 149, आर० बी० एस० के० बोले रोड, बम्बई-400028.	सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। उत्तर प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।

1	2	3	4	5	6
8.	बन्डर बोक्स	288.95	खादी और ग्रामोफोन आयोग ईर्ला, विले पार्ले (पश्चिम), बम्बई-56.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
9.	एंटी एबेजन (केन्द्रीय उत्पाद)	443.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-वैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
10.	एंड्र दैन सैन करिएटिड गाइस एंड डैमन्स इन हिज ओन इमेज	402.03	श्री अजीज फिल्मेज मोशन पिक्चर प्रोड्यूसर्स अम्बलामुक्कु, त्रिवन्द्रम-3		(कामेट्री में प्रदर्शन) दृश्यों और लम्बाई में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं) डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
11.	ओडिस्सर मुख्य घटनावली संख्या 127	304.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-वैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
12.	-तथैव- संख्या 128	312.12	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
13.	स्वतंत्रता के 35 वर्ष	599.00	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
14.	अनुशासन	318.52	श्री हरीश वर्मा डी/2 चान्द सोसाईटी जुहु, चर्च, बम्बई-49		-तथैव-
15.	सहिती चित्र संख्या 374	252.98	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाथ रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनीबेमेंट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, ब्लाक-7 गांधी नगर-382010	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
16.	आन्ध्र केसरी तंगुतुरी प्रकाशम्	426.72	श्री गिडुतुरी सुभम, 6.6.404/15-वीं, गांधी नगर, मिकन्दराबाद-3		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
17.	आप हूय और वे	380	श्री सुभाष जयकर, मणि शक्ती, 19, लघुर्नम रोड, गामदेगी, बम्बई-17	श्री सुभाष जयकर, जयकर फिल्म्स, जयकर बंगला, भुवनेश्वरी, नाम-नलाव और डाकुमेंट्री दार्मी, (पश्चिम रेलवे)।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
18.	ब्लड लाईन	285	कुशारी अनीज पद्मसी, थेर सैनसन, 10-नैट- पैतसी रोड, बम्बई-36.	जिजान्दु इन्टरनेशनल ओरियन्ट क्लब बिल्डिंग, चांपाटी, बम्बई।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
19.	सिनी लैपारोटोमी अपरेजन	213	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-वैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।

1	2	3	4	5	6
20.	बताती गोरगदरी संख्या 28	184.66	आन्ध्र प्रदेश फिल्म विभाग निगम लि०, 11.5.423/1- जफर बाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
21.	स्वयं उपाधि कल्पना	304	श्री जी० के० समी, श्रीमशक्ति फिल्मस, एच-17/4, कोट्टुर पुरम, मद्रास-600085.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
22.	दि गिफ्ट	71	फिल्म प्रभाग-24-पैडर रोड बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
23.	ईजी मैथड	82.292	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
24.	सीढ़ी दर सीढ़ी	282.24	श्री एस० जी० खिर्वाडकर, सूचना और प्रसार उप- निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल।	सूचना और प्रसार निदेशक मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
25.	हमी रोजागारची	291	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
26.	ऑडिस्सर मुख्य घटनावली संख्या 129	290.47	श्री एस० के० राव, सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक एवं संयुक्त सचिव, उड़ीसा सरकार, सूचना और जन संपर्क विभाग, भुवनेश्वर-1		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। उड़ीसा सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
27.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन 40	267	श्री एस० जी० खिर्वाडकर, सूचना और प्रचार उप- निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश, भोपाल।	सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश भोपाल।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
28.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 379	263	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म सेंटर, बम्बई-34,	महाराष्ट्र सरकार	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
29.	दि चाइल्ड	72.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
30.	फासला	26.51	-तथैव-	फिल्म प्रभाग, 4-टालस्टाय मार्ग, नई दिल्ली।	-तथैव-
31.	लीगल एयर	274.00	-तथैव-	-तथैव-	-तथैव-

1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	प्रेस चन्द	582.00	-तथैव-	-तथैव-	-तथैव-
33.	ए. ग्रीडिंग हाउस	274.00	-तथैव-	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26	-तथैव-
34.	दि पीपल आफ इंडिया-एंग्लो इंडियन्स	598.59	फली बिलोमोरिया प्रोडक्शन्स फिल्म सेंटर, चीथा तल, 68 तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-21		-तथैव-
35.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 380	242.00	सुषन्ता और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म सेंटर, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34.		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
36.	मास्टर विनायक	397.00	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
37.	सरस्वती महल (रंगीन)	297.79	श्री रवि वर्मा, 17, मडले द्वितीय गली, मद्रास-600017		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
38.	हैप्पी बर्थडे (रंगीन)	48.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
39.	रिपब्लिक डे परेड 82, (रंगीन)	290.00	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
40.	महानगर (रंगीन)	264.57	श्रीमती विजया वसुदेवा, सी 2/51, टेक्सटिला प्रभादेवी, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
41.	महिती चित्र संख्या 375	298.70	सहायक सुचना निदेशक (फिल्म्स), गुजरात सरकार, 77, डा० ऐनी बैसेट रोड, वोली, बम्बई-25		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
42.	फ्यूलिग ए नेशन	301.00	श्री जी० एल० भारद्वाज, भारद्वाज फिल्म्स, डी-46/432 गांधी नगर, बाव्रा (पूर्व), बम्बई-51		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
43.	वेनिशिंग आर्टिजन्स	251.46	श्री जोग, "गिलिम्पसंस", चालिस्सरी भवन, लैटिन चर्च रोड, त्रिचूर, केरल 680001		-तथैव-
44.	इन्हें संभालिये	115.00	श्री प्रीतम सिंह विर्दी, माधुली, 5-निनाड, अशोक स्तम्भ, नासिक (महाराष्ट्र)		-तथैव-

1	2	3	4	5	6
45.	महिती चित्र संख्या 376	263.65	सहायक फिल्म निदेशक गुजरात सरकार बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक गुजरात सरकार गांधीनगर गुजरात ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
46.	बदलते चित्र	291	सूचना और जन-संपर्क महानिदेशालय महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म सेंटर, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र मार्केट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
47.	सिमफोर्ना आफ इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन	274	फिल्म प्रभाग 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
48.	बर्ड स्ट्राइक	287	---तथैव---		---तथैव---
49.	बचत छोटी लाभ अधिक	222	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म सेंटर, बम्बई-34		---तथैव---
50.	बम्बई फायर ब्रिगेड (रंगों का प्रस्तुतीकरण)	557.78	श्री वी० बी० वाग्बेडी, अध्यक्ष बाईकुल्ला फायर स्टेशन बाईकुल्ला पुल के तजदीक, बम्बई-8		---तथैव---
51.	दि गेम	82	फिल्म प्रभाग 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		---तथैव---
52.	टुवर्ड्स क्लीयर सिटीज	136	---तथैव---		---तथैव---
53.	मिशन आफ फ्रैंडशिप टू मारिशस एंड मोजाम्बिक	296	---तथैव---		---तथैव---
54.	सेंट टामस मार्केट	258.47	अर्जुन कश्यप 3333, काशगरी लेन बाजार सीताराम दिल्ली-6	यशवंत सिंह 1/896, मान सरोवर पार्क शाहदरा, दिल्ली-32	---तथैव---
55.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 29	296	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लि० 11-5-423/1-जफर बाग लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । आन्ध्र प्रदेश मार्केट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
56.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 30	276	---तथैव---		---तथैव---
57.	हैल्थ दि हैल्पिंग हैंड्स	263.35	रेब, थोमस जोसेफ, सी० बी० सी०-1, श्रम कथोलिक सेंटर आयोग मद्रास-1	मि० रान्डोर गार्ड 17 मेन्डाज् स्ट्रीट, मद्रास-7	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
58.	फिफ्टी वीयर्स आफ एअर फोर्स	448	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		---तथैव---
59.	गिफ्ट आफ लव	490	---तथैव---		---तथैव---
60.	विद्वरिग बर्ड्स	252	---तथैव---		---तथैव---

1	2	3	4	5	6
61.	ओडिस्सर मुख्य घटनावली संख्या 130	309-37	श्री एम० के० राव, सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक एवं संयुक्त सचिव, सूचना और जन सम्पर्क विभाग उड़ीसा सरकार, भुवनेश्वर-1		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। उड़ीसा सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
62.	ओडिसा मुख्य घटनावली संख्या 131	520.04	—तथैव—		—तथैव—
63.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 381	233	सूचना और जनसम्पर्क महा-निदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68 तारदेव रोड बम्बई-34	महाराष्ट्र सरकार	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट प्रदर्शन के लिये।
64.	महिती चित्र संख्या 377	226.68	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सननाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेड रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक गुजरात सरकार सचिवालय ब्लॉक नं० 7, गांधी नगर-10	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
65.	रानी बेटी राज करेगी	304.80	किशन प्रसाद, 9, मेराइन, एन० एल० रोड, बान्द्रा, बम्बई-50	बिरेन्द्र सिंह एंड किशन प्रसाद 9, मेराइन एन० एल० रोड बान्द्रा, बम्बई-50	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
66.	चेंजिंग फेस आफ पंजाब	493	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		—तथैव—
67.	अप्पु एंड दि गेम्स	221.590	—तथैव—		—तथैव—
68.	प्लॉट टिस्सु कल्चर	316	—तथैव—		—तथैव—
69.	राधिया की पार्टी	305	श्री कान्त छापिया, ब-1/29, बी० एम० सी० बिल्डिंग, सरदार नगर नं० 4, (कोलीवाड़ा)— बम्बई-37	सैयद कवेसर मेहदी रिजवी, जी-1/29, बी० एम० सी० बिल्डिंग, सरदार नगर नं० 4, (कोलीवाड़ा)— बम्बई-37	—तथैव—
70.	महिती चित्र संख्या 378	228.60	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77 डा० ऐनी बेसेड रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय ब्लॉक-7 गांधी नगर-10	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।

1	2	3	4	5	6
71.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 31	288.00	आन्ध्र प्रदेश विकास निगम लि०, 11-5 423/1 जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4	राज्य फिल्म विकास	समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म । आंध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
72.	महिला सम्मेलनम्	304.00	कृष्ण राव केशे	1-5-6/33 मुशिराबाद हैदराबाद-48	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
73.	टबेर्नट प्लस्ट आल इंडिया एथलेटिक चेमपियनशिप (रंगीन)	594.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
74.	इन्डो-सोवियत फ्रेंडशिप (रंगीन)	302.00	फिल्म प्रभाग 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26	फिल्म प्रभाग 24 पैडर रोड बम्बई-26	—तथैव—
75.	मुख्यम तहसीब महाराष्ट्र में (रंगीन)	297.18	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68 तारदेव रोड बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र राज्य में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
76.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 382	225.00	—तथैव—		समाचार और सामाजिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
77.	साख्यम इन इंडिया	583.37	श्री पी० एम० अर्जाज, मार्फत श्री मधू नायक, फिल्म सम्पादक, बम्बई फिल्म लेबोरेट्रीज, 119, एम० के० बोले रोड, बम्बई-28		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
78.	ए. पैडरटू रिमेम्बर (एम० पी०)	245	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24, पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		—तथैव—
79.	दि ट्रायल रीज	599	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24, पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		—तथैव—
80.	उन्डा अन्धा रेगा	344.72	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार रामनाई रिश्चं लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी वेमेट रोड, वॉली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, प्लॉक न० 7, गार्धनगर-10	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
81.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 101	279.20	धीरेन्द्र पान्डे, उत्तर प्रदेश सूचना विभाग, लखनऊ ।		समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म उत्तर प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
82.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 102	279.20	—तथैव—		—तथैव—

1	2	3	4	5	6
83.	महिषी चित्र संख्या 379	244	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार रामनार्ड रिस्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, ऐनी बैमेट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार मन्त्रिवालय, ब्लॉक नं० 7 गांधी नगर-10	समाचार और घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात मर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
84.	दि क्वाइस इज योर्स (इस फिल्म का नाम बदल कर वाट इज योर क्वाइस रख दिया गया है)	221.125	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
85.	एन० सी० सी० युनीटी डिसिप्लिन एकता और अनुशासन	502.92	मूहम्मद अहम्मद खां, 1, मेराइन एन० एल० रोड, बान्द्रा, बम्बई-50		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
86.	लिफ्ट	302	सूचना और जनसम्पर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र मर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
87.	जैला रायगढ़	302	— तथैव—	— तथैव—	
88.	फायरूटु	34.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
89.	भारतीय अन्त- राष्ट्रीय बर्निका मेला 1982	470.61	श्री एम० के० राव, सूचना और जन सम्पर्क निदेशक एवं संयुक्त सचिव, सूचना और जन सम्पर्क विभाग, उड़ीसा सरकार, भुवनेश्वर-1		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। उड़ीसा मर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
90.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 100	281.33	धीरेन्द्र पाण्डे, मार्फत् फिल्म लेबोरेट्रीज (प्राइवेट) लि०, 149, एस० के० वॉले रोड, बम्बई-28		समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म। उत्तर प्रदेश मर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
91.	मिजोरम	556.87	हरि एस० दास गुप्ता मार्फत, दत्ता पतकर, 611, मथूर एस० बी० पटेल रोड, बोसिबेली पश्चिम, बम्बई।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
92.	विद्यारन सिद्धी	307.24	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनार्ड रिस्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बैमेट रोड, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, मन्त्रिवालय, ब्लॉक नं० 7, गांधी नगर।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। गुजरात मर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
93.	साइंस फार चिल्ड्रेन	422.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।

1	2	3	4	5	6
94.	दि विंग लैस सिटिजन्स	596.19	सिने क्लब आफ इंडिया, मार्फत दत्ता पंनकर, 611, गयूर, एस० बी० पटेल रोड, बोर्ली (पश्चिम), बम्बई-92	सिने क्लब आफ कलकत्ता, 2, जवाहर लाल नेहरू रोड कलकत्ता-13	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
95.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 33	274.32	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लि०, 11-5-423 1, जफर बाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म । आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
96.	अन्तर	70.00	नारा के० फिल्मस, श्रीकृष्ण पाटिल बिल्डिंग, पांडू, पाटिल लेन, अन्धेरी, बम्बई-58	हरीश राणा, के० चौधा L, गुरु दर्शन एस० एस० बाग मार्ग, बम्बई-14	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
97.	एट दि गेम्स	490.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
98.	आण वुख ना दहवा गया	347.47	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाड लेबोरेट्री लि०, डा० ऐनी बेसेट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर ।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
99.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 383	273	सूचना और जन सम्पर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारवेव रोड, बम्बई-400034		समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
100.	आन टु नाईट्य एशियाड	264.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24 पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
101.	वन्दे मातरम्	569.00	—तथैव—	—	—तथैव—
102.	सोमा-ओ, बुंद	562.65	श्री वधावन, सुबुधा 269, खारा-बेलानगर, भूषनेश्वर, उड़ीसा ।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
103.	भक्ति चित्र संख्या 380	264	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाड रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, सचिवालय, ब्लॉक नं० 7, गांधी नगर-10	समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।

1	2	3	4	5	6
104.	वार्ता तर्जिनी संख्या 32	264	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम, 11-5-423 1, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
105.	मे आई थिक मर	560	मैसर्स चलचित्र 3, अमर कोटेज, (पूर्व), बम्बई-59	मि० प्रकाश झा, मारोल, अन्धेरी	डायुमेट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
106.	कार्यक्रम	287	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार, फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डायुमेट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
107.	बेलर एंड विजडम (एम० बी०)	588	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-गैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डायुमेट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
108.	कर्तव्य की पुकार	502.92	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च, लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेंट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर।	—तथैव—
109.	महिनी चित्र संख्या 381	289.56	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	समाचार और सामयिक घट- नाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
110.	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 12	237.44	मि० शा०, फिल्म संपादक सूचना और जन संपर्क विभाग, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	एम० शा०, सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक, बिहार सरकार, पटना।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। बिहार सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये।
111.	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 13	238.06	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
112.	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 14	286.42	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
113.	बिहार समाचार चित्र संख्या 15	260.60	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
113.	एक शर्त	62	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-गैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डायुमेट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये।
114.	गंगा-82 ए टेल आफ एडवेंचर	300	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
115.	यू० एण्ड ई० एम०यू०	147	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	डायुमेट्री फिल्म। दिल्ली सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।

1	2	3	4	5	6
116.	भाग्यचक्र	294	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
117.	सिम्फोनी	90	मधु सूदन कुमार, 2, गीला महल (ई०एस०आई०सी० के सामने) कोलबा, बम्बई-5.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
118.	ज्वेल आफ मणिपुर-पार्ट टू	540.26	जगत मुरारी प्रोडक्शन्स, 105, कल्पतरु, 27/1-बी, एरेन्डबन, पुणे-4		-तथैव-
119.	अनंदर लुक एट खाडी	480.00	फिल्म एंड टेलीविजन इंस्टीट्यूट आफ इंडिया, पुणे-4		-तथैव-
120.	कुटिया कोन्धूस	272.19	श्री दिलीप दत्ता, मार्फत स्वर्गीय अतुल चौधरी चित्र, फिरंगी बाजार, कटक-9, उड़ीसा।		-तथैव-
121.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन 41	263.94	आनन्द हटवाल, मार्फत बम्बई फिल्म लेबोरेटरी, दादर, बम्बई।	श्री सुदीप बनर्जी, सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश, सरकार, भोपाल।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
122.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 34	281	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लि० 11-5-423/1, जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
123.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 384	254	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
124.	अबुल कलाम आजाद	551.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
125.	राजगढ़ विट्नेस्ड	498.00	सूचना और जन संपर्क महा- निदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
126.	लेपारोस्कोपी	154.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पेडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। इसके सभी रूपान्तरों में सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
127.	एक घटना	340.00	-तथैव-		-तथैव-
128.	भक्त कवि दयाराम	333.15	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाथ रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि० 77, डा० ऐनी बेमेंट रोड, थोली, बम्बई-16	सूचना निदेशक गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर।	यदि सभी भाषाओं में डब की गई है तो सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म अन्यथा गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।
129.	आने वाला कल	271.00	मैसर्स वी०एस० एंटरप्राइजिज, 11, राम श्याम निवास, सीता देवी टेम्पल रोड, महीम, बम्बई-16।		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।

1	2	3	4	5	6
130.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन 42	239.00	आनन्द हतरले, बम्बई फिल्म लेबोरेट्रीज, 1-49, एस०के०बोले रोड, दादर, बम्बई ।	सुदीप बनर्जी, सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
131.	कनीन पाथर फार एवरी होम	521.00	शंकर घोष, पी/86-डी०, न्यू सिटी रोड, कलकत्ता-14		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए
132.	महाकावि भारती	598.63	बी० राजगोपाल, साउण्ड एंड लाइट, 28, एल्डेम्स रोड, मद्रास-18		—तथैव—
133.	महाराष्ट्र समाचार संख्या 385	298	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार केन्द्र, 68, तारखेव रोड, बम्बई-34.		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । महाराष्ट्र सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
134.	गीत गाथा पर्वतों ने	596.08	वीरेन्द्र द्विवेदी, फिल्मेज, 104, सी शील, ग्रीन फील्ड एस्टेट, ए०बी० नाथर रोड, जुहु, बम्बई-49.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
135.	पोस्टल लाइफ इन्फॉर्मेशन	362.41	एस०एन० भागवत, मार्फत आनन्द चित्रवाणी, 17-ए, लेन, मेमले डरवाडी, मलाड (पश्चिम) बम्बई-69		—तथैव—
136.	महिती चित्र संख्या 382	298.70	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेंट रोड, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधी नगर ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
137.	उत्तर प्रदेश समाचार संख्या 103	282.00	श्री जे० आर० चतुर्वेदी, सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, सूचना भवन, लखनऊ ।		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । उत्तर प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
138.	विदाई	103.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
139.	फुट प्रिंट्स आफ राम	499.85	बी० प्रभाकर, सी-62 फलोवर क्वीन, वीर देसाई रोड, अंधेरी, बम्बई-58	सूचना और जन संपर्क निदेशक, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ ।	—तथैव—
140.	महिती चित्र संख्या 383	298.70	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, बोर्ली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
141.	बार्ता तरंगिनी नं० 35	259.08	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य विकास निगम लि०, 11-5-423/1, जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-4		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिये ।

1	2	3	4	5	6
142.	हैडल विद केअर (रंगीन)	372.15	सहायक सूचना निदेशक (फिल्म), सूचना और प्रचार निदेशालय, धनराज महल, कोलाबा, बम्बई-5	मैसर्स संचार फिल्म सहकारी समिति लि०, नेहरू फाउन्डेशन फार डेवलपमेंट थाल्टेस टकरा, अहमदाबाद-54 (गुजरात सरकार के लिए बनाई गई)	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
143.	पुश बटन वोटिंग	191.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
144.	बोटिंग स्ट्रिप्ट (केवल संगीत) (रंगीन)	204.00	—तथैव—	—तथैव—	—तथैव—
145.	मध्य प्रदेश समाचार दर्शन 43	232.00	आनन्द हतवलने, मार्फत, सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल ।	सूचना और प्रचार निदेशक, मध्य प्रदेश सरकार, भोपाल ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । मध्य प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
146.	नेनम दहती पावका	182.00	सूचना और जन संपर्क महानिदेशालय, महाराष्ट्र सरकार फिल्म केन्द्र, 68-तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । यदि अन्य भाषाओं में उपयुक्त रूप से बनाई गई हो तो सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
147.	वार्ता तरंगिनी संख्या 36	246.89	आन्ध्र प्रदेश राज्य फिल्म विकास निगम लि०, 11-5-423/1, जफरबाग, लकड़ी का पुल, हैदराबाद-34		समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म । आन्ध्र प्रदेश सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
148.	प्रकृति की गोद में पार्ट-2 (रंगीन)	413.00	सहायक सूचना निदेशक (फिल्म), गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेंट रोड, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर ।	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिये ।
149.	ए साइलेंट आर्ट (सादी)	281.94	मुरजीत दासगुप्ता, 97 ए रीजेंट एस्टेट, कलकत्ता-92		—तथैव—
150.	नैवल डाइवर्स (रंगीन)	387.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.		—तथैव—
151.	लैम्प पोस्ट (रंगीन)	592.53	सालर फिल्म कम्बाइन 69, वी०टी० कम्पाउन्ड मलाड (पश्चिम), बम्बई-64	एम०एम० खाटुदा, 69, वी०टी० कम्पाउन्ड, मलाड (पश्चिम), बम्बई-64	डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । अर्धशहरी और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
152.	महिती चित्र संख्या 384	298.70	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनाई रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज लि०, 77, डा० ऐनी बेसेंट रोड, बम्बई-18.	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, गांधीनगर ।	समाचार और सामयिक घटना- ओं की फिल्म । गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए ।
153.	दि हिडन एनीमो (रंगीन)	285.60	श्री बी०डी० गर्ग, डी-11, कामर्स सेंटर, तारदेव रोड, बम्बई-34		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म । सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए ।

1	2	3	4	5	6
154.	एन एफर्ट (प्रयास) (रंगीन)	232.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.		डाकुमेंट्री फिल्म। सामान्य प्रदर्शन के लिए।
155.	डोरी ए सोशल ईविल	37.00	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
156.	हेप्पीनेस अनटू अदर्स	608	होमी डी० सेठना, 67, भोलाभाई देसाई रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
157.	डाटर एज गुड एज सन	116	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
158.	टुवर्ड्स सेवथ तॉन एलाइन्ड समिट	608	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
159.	फूड और प्वायजन	149	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26.		-तथैव-
160.	आल इंडिया इंस्टीट्यूट आफ मेडिकल साइंसेज ए पोर्टेंट	516	फिल्म प्रभाग, 24-पैडर रोड, बम्बई-26		-तथैव-
161.	महिती चित्र संख्या 385	298.70	सहायक सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार, रामनार्ड, रिसर्च लेबोरेट्रीज, लि० बोली, बम्बई-18	सूचना निदेशक, गुजरात सरकार।	समाचार और सामयिक घटनाओं की फिल्म। गुजरात सर्किट में प्रदर्शन के लिए।

[फाइल संख्या 315/7/82-एफ (पी)]

सुकुमार मंडल, डेस्क अधिकारी

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING ORDER

New Delhi, the 6th July, 1983

S.O. 3078.—In pursuance of the directions issued under the provision of each of the enactments specified in the First Schedule to the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 3792 dated 2nd December, 1966 the Central Government after considering recommendations of the Films Advisory Board, Bombay hereby approves the films specified in column 2 of the Schedule annexed hereto in all its/their language versions to be of the description specified against it/each in column 6 of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Title of the film	Length of the film in metres	Name of the Applicant	Name of the producer	Brief synopsis whether a scientific film or for educational purpose or a film dealing with news & current events or documentary film
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Mahiti Chitra No. 373	263.65	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratories Ltd. 77, Dr. Annie Basant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block, No. 7 Gandhi-Nagar-10.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Maharashtra News No. 378	264	Directorate General of Information & Public Relation, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road Bombay-34.	Directorate General of Information & Public Relation, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.	'News & Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
3.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 97	282	Kailash Narain Srivastava C/o Bombay Film Laboratories, 149, R.B.S. K. Bole Road, Bombay-28.	Director of Information & Public Relation Govt. of U.P.	'News & Current Events' for release in UP circuit.
4.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 98	282	-do-	-do-	-do-
5.	Krishnanattam	498.04	Adoor Gopalakrishnan 695017.	Darsaman, Trivandrum-	'Documentary' for general release.
6.	Precarious Journey	105	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-400026.		'Educational' for general release.
7.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 99	282	Kailash Narain Srivastava C/o Film Laboratories, 149, R.B.S.K. Bole Road, Bombay-400028.	The Director of Information & Public Relation, Govt. of U.P., Lucknow.	'News & Current Events' for release in U.P. circuit.
8.	Wonder Box	288.95	Khadi & V.I. Commission Irla, Vile Parle (W) Bombay-56.		'Documentary' for general release.
9.	Anti-Evasion (Central Excise)	443.00	Films Division, 24, Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
10.	And then Man created Gods and Demons in his own image.	402.03	Sri. Azeez Filmage Motion Picture Producers Ambalamukku, Trivandrum-3.		(Additions in commentary. Visuals and length remain unaltered) 'Documentary' for general release.
11.	Odissar Mukhya Ghatanabali No. 127	304.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	Shri M.K. Rao Director of Information & Public Relations & Joint Secretary to the Govt. of Orissa, Information & Public Relations Deptt., Bhubaneswar.	'News & Current Events' release in Orissa Circuit.
12.	-do- No. 128	312.12	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	-do-	-do-
13.	Thirty Five Years of freedom	599	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release
14.	Anushasan	318.52	Shri Harish Verma, D/2, Chand Society, Juhu-Church Bombay-49.		-do-

1	2	3	4	5	6
15.	Mahiti Chitra No. 374	252.98	Asst. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratories, Ltd., 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block No. 7, Gandhinagar- 382010.	'News and Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
16.	Andhra Keshri Tanguturi Prakasam	426.72	Shri Giduthuri Suryam, 6-6-404/15B, Gandhinagar, Secunderabad-3.		'Documentary' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
17.	Aap Hum Aur Ven	380	Shri Subhash Jayakar, Mani Bhavan, 19, Laburnum Road, Gamdevi. Bombay-17.	Shri Subhash Jayakar, Jayakar Films, Jayakar's Bungalow Sutarali, Tam-Talao At & Post VASI (W. Rly.)	'Documentary' for general release.
18.	Blood Line	285	Miss Anee Padamsee, Ther Mansion, 10A, Napeansea Road, Bombay-36.	Giants International, Orient Club Building, Chowpathy Bombay.	-do-
19.	Mini Laparot- omy Operation	213	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
20.	Varta Tarangini No. 28	184.66	Andhra Pradesh, Film Development Corporation Ltd., 11-5-423/1 Zafarabagh Lakdi-Ka- pool, Hyderabad-4.		'News & Current Events' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
21.	Swayam Upadhi Kalapana	304	Shri G.K. Samy, Om Sakthi Films, H-17/4, Kotturpuram, Madras-600085.		'Documentary' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
22.	The Gift	71	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
23.	Easy Method	82.292	-do-		-do-
24.	Sidhi Dar Sidhi	282.24	Shri S.G. Khirwadkar, Dy. Director of Information & Publicity, M.P. Bhopal.	Director, Information & Publicity, M.P., Bhopal.	'Documentary' for release in M.P. circuit.
25.	Hami Rojaga- rachi	291	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Taradeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
26.	Oidssar Mukhya Ghatanabeli No. 129	290.47	Shri M.K. Rao, Director of Information & Public Relations, & Joint Secretary to Government of Orissa, Information & Public Relations Department, Bhubaneswar-1.		'News & Current Events' for release in Orissa circuit.
27.	M.P. Samachar Darshan-40	267	Shri S.G. Khirwadkar Dy. Director of Information & Publicity, M.P., Bhopal.	Director of Information & Publicity, M.P., Bhopal	'News & Current Events' for release in M.P. circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
28.	Maharashtra News No. 379	263	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, Bombay-34.	Govt. of Maharashtra	'News & Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
29.	The Child	72.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	'Documentary' for General release.
30.	Fasala	26.51	-do-	Films Division 4-Tolstoy Marg, New Delhi.	-do-
31.	Legal Aid	274.00	-do-	-do-	-do-
32.	Prem Chand	582.00	-do-	-do-	-do-
33.	A Growing House	274.00	-do-	Film Division, Peddar Road, Bombay-26.	-do-
34.	The People of India Anglo Indians	598.50	Fali Bilimoria Productions Film Centre, 4th Floor, 68 Tardeo Rd, Bombay-21.		-do-
35.	Maharashtra News No. 380.	242.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68 Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'News and Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
36.	Master Vinayak	397.00	-do-		-do-
37.	Saraswathi Mahal (Colour)	297.79	Shri Ravi Varma 17, Madeley Second St., Madras 600 017.		'Documentary' for general release.
38.	Happy Birthday (Colour)	48.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay 26		-do-
39.	Republic Day Parade '82 (Colour)	290.00	-do-		-do-
40.	Mahanagar (Colour)	264.57	Smt. Vijaya Vasudeva, C2/51. Textilla, Prabhadevi, Bombay-25.		'Documentary' for general release.
41.	Mahiti Chitra No. 375	298.70	Asstt. Director of Information (Films) Govt. of Gujarat, 77, Dr. Annie Basant Road, Worli Bombay-28		'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
42.	Fuelling a Nation	301.00	Shri G.L. Bhardwaj, Bhardwaj Films, B-46/432 Gandhi Nagar, Bandra (East), Bombay-51.		'Documentary' for General release.
43.	Vanishing Artisans	251.46	Shri Joe, "Gilmense" Chalissery Bhavan, Latin Church Road, Trichur, Kerala-680001.		-do-
44.	Inhe Samhaliye	115.00	Shri Preetamsingh Birdi, Madhuli, 5, Ninad, Ashok Stamba, Nasik (Maharashtra)		-do-
45.	Mahiti Chitra No. 376	263.65	Asstt. Director of Films, Govt. of Gujarat, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar, Gujarat.	'News and Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
46.	Badalte Chitra	291	Director General of Information & Public Relations Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, Bombay-34.		'News and current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
47.	Symphony of Industrialisation	274	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for General release.
48.	Bird Strike	287	-do-	-do-	-do-
49.	Bachat Choti Labh Adhik	222	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, Bombay-34.		-do-
50.	Bombay Fire Brigade Presentation of Colours.	557.78	Mr. V.B. Warkhedji President Byculla Fire Station Near Byculla Bridge, Bombay-8.		-do-
51.	The Game	82	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26		-do-
52.	Towards Cleaner Cities	136	-do-	-do-	-do-
53.	Mission of Friendship to Mauritius and Mozambique	296	-do-	-do-	-do-
54.	St. Thomas Mount	258.47	Arjun Kashyap, 3333 Kashgari, Lane Bazar Sitaram, Delhi-6.	Yashwant Singh, 1/896 Man Sanower Park Shahadra, Delhi-32.	-do-
55.	Varta Tarangini No. 29	296	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corporation, Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Hyderabad-4.	Zafarbagh, Lakdi Ka-pool,	'News & Current Events' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
56.	Varta Tatangini No. 30	276	-do-	-do-	-do-
57.	Help the Helping Hands	263.35	Rev. Thomas Joseph, Executive Secretary, CBC I Commission for Labour Catholic Centre Madras-1.	Mr. Randoi Guy 17, Menad's Street, Madras-7.	'Documentary' for general release.
58.	Fifty Years of AIR Force	448	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
59.	Gift of Love	490	-do-	-do-	-do-
60.	Withering Buds	252	-do-	-do-	-do-
61.	Od Issar Mukhyaghatanabali No. 130	309.37	Shri M. K. Rao, Director of Information & Public Relations & Jt. Secretary to Govt. of Orissa Information & R. R. Deptt. Bhubaneswar-1.		'News & Current Events' for release in Orissa circuit.
62.	Od Issar Mukhyaghatanabali No. 131	320.04	-do-	-do-	-do-
63.	Maharashtra News No. 381	233	Directorate General Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68 Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.	Govt. of Maharashtra	'News & Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
64.	Mahiti Chitra No. 377	226.88	Asstt. Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratories Ltd., 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block No. 7, Gandhinagar-10.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
65.	Rani Beti Raj Karegi	304.80	Kishna Prasad, 9, Marina, N. L. Road, Bandra, Bombay-50	Birendra Singh & Kishna Prasad, 9 Marina, N. L. Road, Bandra, Bombay-50.	'Documentary' for general release.
66.	Changing Face of Punjab	493	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
67.	Appu at The Games	221.590	-do-	-do-	-do-
68.	Plant Tissue Culture	316	-do-	-do-	-do-
69.	Radha Ki Paati	305	Shri Kant Chhapia, B-1/29, B.M.C. Building Sardar Nagar No. 4, Koliwada, Bombay-37.	Sayed Quaisar Mehndi Rizvi, B-1/29, BMC Bldg., Sardar Nagar, Bombay-26 (Koliwada).	-do-
70.	Mahiti Chitra No. 378	228.60	Asstt. Director, Information Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd. 77, Dr. A B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block 7, Gandhinagar-10.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
71.	Varta Trangini No. 31	228.00	Andhra Pradesh State, Film Development Corp., Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-Ka-pool, Hyderabad-4.		'News' & Current Events for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
72.	Mahila Samkshemam	304.00	Krishna Rao Keshav 1-5-6/33, Sri Krishna Colony, Musheerabad, Hyderabad-48.		'Documentary' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
73.	21st All India Athletic Championship (Colour)	594.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
74.	Indo-Soviet Friendship (Colour)	302.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
75.	Muslim Tehzeeb Maharashtra Mein (Colour)	297.18	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Center 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for released in Maharashtra State.

1	2	3	4	5	6
76.	Maharashtra News No. 382	225.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'News & Current Event' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
77.	Mosques in India	583.37	Mr. P.M. Azetz, C/o Mr. Madhu Naik, Film Editor Bombay Film Laboratories, 149, S. K. Bole Road, Bombay-28.		'Documentary' for general release.
78.	A Fair To Member (S.V)	245	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
79.	The Trial Games	599		-do-	-do-
80.	Unda Andha Rethi	344.72	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd. 77, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya Block No 7. Gandhinagar-10	'Documentary' for release in Gujarat circuit.
81.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 101	279.20	Dhirendra Pand e, U.P. Information Deptt. Lucknow		'News & Current Events' for release in U.P. circuit.
82.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 102	280.42	-do-	-do-	-do-
83.	Mahiti Chitra No. 379	244	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab., Ltd. 77, Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-18	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya , Block No. 7 Gandhinagar-10.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
84.	The Choice Is Yours (The title of this film has been changed to What Is Your Choice)	221.125	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
85.	N.C.C. Unity Discipline Ekta Aur Anushasan	502.92	Muhammad Ahmad Khan 11, Marina N. L. Road, Bandra, Bombay-50.		'Documentary' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
86.	Lift	302	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations , Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		-do-
87.	Jailah Raigadh	302	-do-	-do-	-do-
88.	For You Too	34.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.

1	2	3	4	5	6
89.	Bharatiya Antarrastriya Banikya Mela-1982	470.61	Shri M. K. Rao, Director of Information & Public Relations, & Jt. Secy. to Govt. of Orissa, Information & P. R. Deptt. Bhubaneswar-1.		'Documentary' for release in Orissa circuit.
90.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 100	281.33	Direndra Pande C/o Bombay Film Lab.(P) Ltd., 149, S. K. Bole Road, Bombay-28.		'News & Current Events' for release in UP circuit.
91.	Mizoram	556.87	Hari S. Dasgupta Productions, C/o Datta Patankar 611, Mayur S.V. Patel Road, Borivli West, Bombay.		'Documentary' for general release.
92.	Biyaran Suddhi	307.24	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Remnord Research Lab. Ltd. 77, Dr. A.B. Road, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Sachivalaya, Block No. 7, Gandhinagar.	'Documentary' for release in Gujarat circuit.
93.	Science for Children	422.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
94.	The Wingless Citizens	596.19	Cine Club of India, C/o Dutta Patankar 611, Mayur, S. V. Patel Road, Borivli (W), Bombay-92.	Cine Club of Calcutta 2, Jawaharlal Nehru Road, Calcutta-13.	-do-
95.	Varta Tarangini No. 33	274.32	Andhra Pradesh State Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-pool, Hyderabad-4.	Film Development Corpn.,	'News & Current Events' for release in Andhra Pradesh circuit.
96.	Antar	70.00	Tara K. Films, Shree Krishan Patil Bldg., Pandu Patil Lane, Andheri, Bombay-58.	Harish Rana K Chaubal Guru Darshan S.S. Wagh Marg, Bombay-14.	'Documentary' for release in Gujarat circuit.
97.	At The Games	490.00	Films Division 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
98.	Aae Dukh Na Dahada Gaya	347.47	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Remnord Research Lab. Ltd., Dr. A. B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	Documentary for release in Gujarat circuit.
99.	Maharashtra News No. 383	273.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-400034		'News & Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
100.	On To IX ASIAD	264.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
101.	Vandemataram	569.00	-do-	-do-	-do-
102.	Soma-O-Budai	562.65	Shri Brundaban Subudhi, 269 Kharabela Nagar, Bhubaneswar, Orissa.		-do-

1	2	3	4	5	6
103.	Mahiti Chitra No. 380	267.56	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd., 77, Dr. A. B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat Sachivalaya, Block, 7, Gandhinagar-10.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat Circuit.
104.	Varta Tarangini No. 32	264.00	A. P. State Film Dev. Corpn., Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Lakdi-ka-pul, Hyderabad-4.		'News & Current Events' for release in A.P. circuit.
105.	May I Think Sir	569.00	M/s Chalchitra Mr. Prakash Jha, 3, Amar Cottage, Marol, Andheri(E), Bombay-59.		'Documentary' for general release.
106.	Karyakram	287.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for release in Maharashtra circuit.
107.	Valour And Wisdom (S.V.)	588.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
108.	Kartavya Ki Pukar	502.92	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd. 77, Dr. A. B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	'Documentary' for general release.
109.	Mahiti Chitra No. 381	289.56	-do-	-do-	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
110.	Bihar Samachar Chitra No. 12	237.44	M. Jha, Film Editor, Information & Public Relations Deptt., Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	S. Jha, Director of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.	'News & Current Events' for release in Bihar circuit.
111.	Bihar Samachar Chitra No. 13	238.06	-do-	-do-	-do-
112.	Bihar Samachar Chitra No. 14	286.42	-do-	-do-	-do-
113.	Bihar Samachar Chitra No. 15	260.60	-do-	-do-	-do-
113A.	Ek Shart	62.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
114.	Ganga-82 A Tale of Adventure	300.00	-do-	-do-	-do-
115.	You And E.M.U.	147.00	-do-	-do-	'Documentary' for release in Delhi circuit.
116.	Bhagyachakra	294.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for release in Maharashtra circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
117. Symphony	90.00	Madhusudan Kumar 2, Shiela Mahal (Opp. ESIC) Colaba, Bombay-5.		'Documentary' for general release.	
118. Jewel of Manipur Part-II	540.26	Jagat Murari Productions, 105, Kalpataru, 27/1-B. Era udavare, Pune-4.		-do-	
119. Another Look At Khadi	480.00	Film & T.V. Institute of India, Pune-4.		-do-	
120. Kutia Konds	272.19	Shri Dilip Datta, C/o Late Atul Ch. Chittra, Firingi Bazar, Cuttack-9, Orissa.		'Documentary' for general release.	
121. M.P. Samachar Darshan-41	263.94	Anand Hatvale, Shri Sudeep Banerjee C/o. Bombay Film Director, Lab. Dadar, Bombay Information & Publicity, Govt. of M.P., Bhopal.		'News & Current Events' for release in M.P. circuit.	
122. Varta Tarangini No. 34	281.00	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corpn. Ltd. 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-pool, Hyderabad-4.		'News & Current Events' for release in A.P. circuit.	
123. Maharashtra News No. 384	254.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'News & Current Events' for release in Maharashtra circuit.	
124. Abul Kalam Azad	551.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.	
125. Rajgad Witnessed	498.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for release in Maharashtra circuit.	
126. Laparoscopy Operation	154.00	Films Divisions, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release in all its versions.	
127. Ek Ghatna	340.00	-do-		-do-	
128. Bhakta Kavi Dayaram	333.15	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd., 77, Dr. A.B. Road, Worli, Bombay-16.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	For general release as 'Documentary' If dubbed in all languages Otherwise, release in Gujarat circuit.	
129. Annewala Kal	271.00	M/s. V. S. Enterprises 11, Ram Shyam Nivas, Sitta Devi Temple Road, Mahim, Bombay-16.		'Documentary' for general release.	
130. M.P. Samachar Darshan 42	239.00	Anand Hatvale, Sudeep Banerjee, Bombay Film Director, Laboratories, 1-49, S. N. Bole Road, Dadar, Bombay. Information & Publicity, Govt. of M.P., Bhopal		'News & Current Events' for release in M.P. circuit.	
131. Clean Power for Every Home	521.00	Shankar Ghosh, P/86-D, New CIT Road, Calcutta-14.		'Documentary' for general release.	
132. Mahakavi Bharati	598.63	V. Rajagopal, Sound & Sight, 28, Eldams Road, Madras-18		-do-	
133. Maharashtra News No. 385	298	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68, Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'News & Current Events' release in Maharashtra circuit,	

1	2	3	4	5	6
134.	Gect Gaya Parvaton Ne	596.08	Virendra Dwivedi, Filmage, 104, Sea Sheel, Greenfield Estate, A.B. Nair Road, Juhu, Bombay-49.		'Documentary' for general release.
135.	Postal Life Insurance	362.41	S. N. Bhagwat, C/o. Anand Chitrayani, 17-A Lane, Memledarwadi, Malad (West) Bombay-69.		-do-
136.	Mahitichitra No. 382	298.70	Asst. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Laboratories Ltd., 77, Dr. A. B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	'News and Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
137.	Uttar Pradesh Samachar No. 103	282.00	Shri J. R. Chaturvedi, Director of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of U.P., Soochana Bhavan, Lucknow.	The Director of Information and Public Relations, Govt. of U.P., Soochana Bhavan, Lucknow.	'Documentary' for general release.
138.	Vidai	103.00	Film Divn., 24 Peddar Rd., Bombay-26.	—	'Documentary' Film general release.
139.	Foot Prints of Ram	499.85	V. Prabhakar, C-62, Flower Queen, Veere Desai Road, Andheri, Bombay-58.	The Director of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of U.P., Lucknow.	'Documentary' for general release.
140.	Mahiti Chitra No. 383	298.70	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Res. Lab. Ltd., Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
141.	Varta Tarangini No. 35	259.08	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corpn. Ltd. 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-pool, Hyderabad-4.		'News & Current Events' for release in A.P. circuit.
142.	Handle with Care (Colour)	372.15	Asstt. Director of Information (Films), Information & Publicity Dte. Ltd., Dhanraj Mahal, Colaba, Bombay-5.	M/s. Sanchar Film Cooperative Society Ltd., Nehru Foundation for Development Thaltes Takra, Ahmedabad-54. (Made for the Govt. of Gujarat.)	'Documentary' for general release.
143.	Push Button Voting	191.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
144.	Beating Retreat (Music Only) (Colour)	204.00	-do-		-do-
145.	Madhya Pradesh Samachar Drashan 43.	232.00	Anand Hatvalne, C/o. Director, Information & Publicity, Govt. of M.P., Bhopal.	Director, Information & Publicity, Govt. of M.P., Bhopal.	'News & Current Events' for release in M.P. circuit.

1	2	3	4	5	6
146.	Nainam Dahati Pavaka	182.00	Directorate General of Information & Public Relations, Govt. of Maharashtra, Film Centre, 68-Tardeo Road, Bombay-34.		'Documentary' for General release if made suitably in other languages.
147.	Varta Tarangini No. 36	246.89	Andhra Pradesh State Film Development Corpn. Ltd., 11-5-423/1, Zafarbagh, Lakdi-ka-Pool, Hyderabad-34.		'News & Current Events' for release in A. P. circuit.
148.	Prakruti Ki Godme Part-2 (Colour)	413.00	Asstt. Director of Informations (Films), Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research Lab. Ltd., 77, Dr. A.B. Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Infromation, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	'Documentary' for general release.
149.	A Silent Art (B&W)	281.94	Surajit Dasgupta, 97A, Regent Estate, Calcutta-92.		-do-
150.	Naval Divers (Colour)	387.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
151.	Lamp Post (Colour)	592.53	Solar Films, Combine 69, B.T. Compound Malad (West), Bombay-64.	S.S. Khatuda, 69, B.T. Compound Malad (West), Bombay-64.	'Documentary' for release in semi-urban and rural areas.
152.	Mahitichitra No. 384	298.70	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research, Lab. Ltd., 77, Dr. A.B. Road, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.
153.	The Hidden Enemy (Colour)	285.60	Shri B.D. Garga D-11, Road, Bombay-34.	Commerce Centre, Tardeo	'Documentary' for general release.
154.	An Effort (Prayaas) (Colour)	232.00	Films Division, 24 Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
155.	Dowry & Social Evil	37.00	-do-		-do-
156.	Happiness Unto Others	608.00	Homi D. Sethna, 67, Bholabhai Desai Road, Bombay-26.		-do-
157.	Daughter As Good As Son	116.00	Films Division, 24-Peddar Road, Bombay-26.		'Documentary' for general release.
158.	Towards 7th Non-Aligned Summit	608.00	-do-		-do-
159.	Food or Poison	149.00	-do-		-do-
160.	All-India Institute of Medical Sciences—A Portrait	516.00	-do-		-do-
161.	Mahiti Chitra No. 385	298.70	Asstt. Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat, Ramnord Research, Lab. Ltd., Worli, Bombay-18.	Director of Information, Govt. of Gujarat.	'News & Current Events' for release in Gujarat circuit.

नई दिल्ली, 21 जुलाई, 1983

क्र० आ० 3079 :—चलचित्र (सेंसर) नियम, 1958 के नियम 3 के साथ पठित चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) के द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, श्री विक्रम सिंह को केन्द्रीय फिल्म प्रमाणन बोर्ड के अंशकालिक अध्यक्ष के पद पर 8-7-83 (अपराह्न) से आगे आदेश तक नियुक्त करती है।

[फाइल संख्या 802/22/79-एफ० (सी०)]

के० एस० वेकटारमण, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1983

S.O. 3079.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Cinematograph Act, 1952 read with rule 3 of the Cinematograph (Certification) Rules 1983, the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri Bikram Singh as Part-time Chairman of the Central Board of Film Certification with effect from 8-7-1983 A.N. until further orders.

[File No. 802/22/79-F(C)]

K.S. VENKATARAMAN, Under Secy.

रेल मंत्रालय

(रेलवे बोर्ड)

नई दिल्ली, 23 जुलाई, 1983

क्र० आ० 3080—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिशोधियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुये तथा भारत सरकार निर्माण, आवास तथा संभरण मंत्रालय की क्रमशः 22 फरवरी, 1961, 13 फरवरी, 1962, 29 अलाई, 1968, 18 फरवरी, 1969 तथा 6 मई, 1972 की अधिसूचना सां० आ० संख्या 493, 568, 2760, 787 तथा 1050 स्वास्थ्य तथा परिवार नियोजन तथा निर्माण एवं आवास तथा शहरी विकास मंत्रालय की क्रमशः 22 अप्रैल, 1969 तथा 3 जुलाई, 1970 की अधिसूचना सां० आ० सं० 1625 तथा 2344 निर्माण और आवास मंत्रालय की क्रमशः 8 दिसम्बर, 1972 तथा 28 अगस्त, 1976 की अधिसूचना सां० आ० सं० 5258 तथा 3342 तथा रेल मंत्रालय की क्रमशः 20 फरवरी, 1963, 23 सितम्बर, 1974, 10 मार्च, 1977, 11 अगस्त, 1978, 26 मई, 1980, 7 सितम्बर, 1980, 20 मार्च, 1981, 3 मार्च, 1982, 14 जून, 1982 तथा 11 दिसम्बर, 1982 की अधिसूचनाओं सां० आ० सं० 563, 2875, 1036, 2708, 1559, 2646, 1190, 1204, 2346 तथा 236 के अतिरिक्त में राष्ट्रपति एतद्वारा नीचे दी गई तालिका

के कालम (i) में उल्लिखित अधिकारियों, जो राजस्वित अधिकारी है, को उक्त अधिनियम के प्रयोजनार्थ सम्पदा अधिकारी नियुक्त करती है तथा उक्त अधिकारियों को यह निदेश देती है कि वे उक्त तालिका के कालम (2) में निदिष्ट संबंधित प्रविष्टि सरकारी स्थान के संबंध में उक्त अधिनियम द्वारा या के अंतर्गत सम्पदा अधिकारियों को प्रदत्त शक्तियों का, अपने क्षेत्राधिकारी की स्थानीय सीमाओं में, प्रयोग करें और सौंपे गये कर्तव्यों को पूरा करें।

तालिका

अधिकारियों का पद नाम सरकारी स्थानों के वर्ग तथा क्षेत्राधिकारी की स्थानीय सीमा

1	2
1. (i) मुख्य इंजीनियर, मुख्य इंजीनियर सामान्य, मुख्य योजना एवं विकास इंजीनियर, मुख्य रेलपथ इंजीनियर तथा मुख्य पुल इंजीनियर मध्य रेलवे।	संपूर्ण मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(ii) अवर मुख्य इंजीनियर (दक्षिण) (रेलपथ) उत्तर तथा (मध्य) मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(iii) सभी उप मुख्य इंजीनियर, तथा उप-मुख्य इंजीनियर (निर्माण), मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(iv) मुख्य इंजीनियर (निर्माण), मध्य रेलवे।	संपूर्ण मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(v) इंजीनियर-इन-चार्ज (निर्माण) मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(vi) सभी मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(vii) सभी अवर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।
(viii) सभी बरिष्ठ मंडल इंजीनियर, मध्य रेलवे।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान।

[illegible]

1	2
(x) सभी अपर मुख्य इंजीनियर, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(xi) सभी मंडल इंजीनियर, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(xii) टाउन इंजीनियर, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे, गोरखपुर ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
5. (i) सभी वरिष्ठ मंडल इंजीनियर, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(ii) सभी मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(iii) सभी मंडल इंजीनियर, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(iv) सभी अतिरिक्त मंडल कार्यकारी अधिकारी, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(v) सभी अपर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(vi) उप महाप्रबंधक (सामान्य) पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे ।	सम्पूर्ण पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
6. (i) सभी मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, दक्षिण रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, दक्षिण रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(ii) सभी अपर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, दक्षिण रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, दक्षिण रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।

1	2
(iii) सभी अपर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक (तकनीकी) तथा सभी अपर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक (परिचालन), दक्षिण रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, दक्षिण रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(iv) अपर मुख्य इंजीनियर दक्षिण रेलवे, गोलडन राक ।	दक्षिण रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत उत्तर में अम्बीकापुरम तथा सैनथानी-पुरम, पश्चिम में सुब्रमनियम-पुरम तथा पोन्मलाईपेट्ट, दक्षिण में किलाकाल केडेट कोटाई मोट्टेपेट्ट तथा पोन्मलाईपेट्टी तथा पूर्व में कालका-कोडरकोटाई द्वारा घिरे हुये पोन्नेलाई क्षेत्र पर गोलडन राक रेलवे कालोनी के अंतर्गत स्थानीय स्थान ।
7. (i) सभी मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(ii) दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे के सिकन्दराबाद (ब०ला०) हैबराबाद (भी०ला०), विजयवाड़ा, हुबली तथा गुन्तकल मंडलों के वरिष्ठ मंडल इंजीनियर तथा मंडल इंजीनियर ।	उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
8. (i) सम्पदा अधिकारी, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे, खड़गपुर ।	आदा और खड़गपुर मंडलों तथा खड़गपुर मंडल के गार्डन रीच गालीमार और संतरा-गाची क्षेत्रों की स्थानीय सीमाओं में स्थित दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रणाधीन स्थान ।
(ii) सम्पदा अधिकारी, बिलासपुर, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे, बिलासपुर ।	चक्रधरपुर तथा नागपुर मंडलों की स्थानीय सीमाओं के अंतर्गत स्थित दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
(iii) सम्पदा अधिकारी, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे, बाल्तेर ।	बाल्तेर और खुर्दा रोड मंडलों की स्थानीय सीमाओं के अंतर्गत स्थित, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।

1

2

MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

(Railway Board)

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1983,

- 9 (j) सभी मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, पश्चिम रेलवे । उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पश्चिम रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
- (ii) सभी वरिष्ठ मंडल इंजीनियर, पश्चिम रेलवे/सभी मंडल इंजीनियर, पश्चिम रेलवे । उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पश्चिम रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
- (iii) सभी अपर मंडल रेल प्रबंधक, पश्चिम रेलवे । उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, पश्चिम रेलवे के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
10. उप महाप्रबंधक, चित्तरंजन रेल इंजन कारखाना । चित्तरंजन रेल इंजन कारखाने के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
11. सभी उप मुख्य यांत्रिक इंजीनियर, उप मुख्य इंजीनियर तथा प्रिंसिपल ट्रेनिंग स्कूल, डीजल रेल इंजन कारखाना । उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत, डीजल रेल इंजन कारखाने के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
12. मुख्य इंजीनियर तथा सभी अपर मुख्य यांत्रिक इंजीनियर, सबारी डिव्वा कारखाना । उनके अपने क्षेत्राधिकार की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत सबारी डिव्वा कारखाने के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
13. उप मुख्य इंजीनियर, पहिया एवं धुरा संयंत्र बैंगलूर । पहिया एवं धुरा संयंत्र के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
14. उप मुख्य इंजीनियर, डीजल पुर्जा कारखाना, पटियाला । डीजल पुर्जा कारखाना के प्रशासनिक नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।
15. उप महाप्रबंधक, मैट्रो रेलवे, कलकत्ता । मैट्रो रेलवे (संकर्म निर्माण) अधिनियम, 1978 (1978 का 33) में यथा परिभाषित कलकत्ता महानगर शहर की सीमाओं के अंतर्गत मैट्रो रेलवे के नियंत्रण के अंतर्गत स्थान ।

S.O. 3080.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India, in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply number S.Os. 493, 568, 276J, 787 and 1050 dated the 22nd February, 1961, 13th February, 1962, 29th July, 1968, 18th February, 1969 and 6th May, 1972 respectively in the Ministry of Health and Family Planning and Works and Housing and Urban Development notification number S.Os. 1625 and 2344 dated the 22nd April, 1969 and 3rd July 1970 respectively, in the Ministry of Work and Housing notification number S.Os. 5258 and 3342 dated the 8th December, 1972 and 28th August, 1976 respectively, and in the Ministry of Railways notification number S.Os. 563, 2875, 1936, 2708, 1559, 2646, 1190, 1204, 2346 and 236 dated the 20th February 1963, 23rd September 1974, 10th March, 1977, 11th August, 1978, 26th May, 1980, 7th September 1980, 20th March 1981, 3rd March, 1982, 14th June, 1982 and 11th December, 1982 respectively, the President hereby appoints the officers mentioned in column 1 of the Table below, being Gazetted Officers of the Government to be Estate Officers for the purpose of the said Act and further directs that the said officers shall exercise the powers conferred and perform the duties imposed on estate Officers by under the said Act within the local limits of their jurisdiction in respect of the public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column (2) of the said Table.

TABLE

Designation of the Officers	Categories of public premises and local limits of jurisdiction
(1)	(2)
1. (i) Chief Engineer, Chief Engineer General, Chief Planning and Development Engineer, Chief Track Engineer, and Chief Bridge Engineer, Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Central Railway.
(ii) Additional Chief Engineers (South), (Track), North and (Central), Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(iii) All Deputy Chief Engineers, and Deputy Chief Engineers (Central) Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(iv) Chief Engineer (Construction) Central Railway	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Central Railway.
(v) Engineers-in-Chief, (Construction) Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(vi) All Divisional Railway Managers, Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.

[फाइल सं० 82/डब्ल्यू 2/14/4]

हिम्मत सिंह, सचिव, रेलवे बोर्ड
भारत के राष्ट्रपति के लिये तथा उनकी ओर से

1	2
(vii) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers, Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(viii) All Senior Divisional Engineers, Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(ix) Chief Engineer (Survey & Construction) Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Central Railway.
(x) All Divisional Engineers, Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
2. (i) All Divisional Engineers, Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(ii) All Divisional Railway Managers, Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Eastern Railway in their respective jurisdiction.
(iii) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers, Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of Eastern Railway in their respective jurisdiction.
(iv) All Senior Divisional Engineers, Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of Eastern Railway in their respective jurisdiction.
(v) Estate Officer, Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of Eastern Railway within his jurisdiction.
3. (i) Dy. General Manager (G), Northern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Northern Railway.
(ii) Estate Officer, Baroda House.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway within his jurisdiction.
(iii) All Divisional Superintending Engineers (Cords)/All Senior Divisional Engineers, Northern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Northern Railway under their respective jurisdiction.
(iv) All Divisional Railway Managers, Northern Railway	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway under their respective jurisdiction.
(v) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers, Northern Railway	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway under their respective jurisdiction.

1	2
(vi) All Additional Chief Engineers, Northern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(vii) All Divisional Engineers [except Divisional Engineer (G)], Northern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
4. (i) Deputy General Manager, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire North Eastern Railway.
(ii) All Deputy Chief Engineers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(iii) All Divisional Railway Managers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(iv) All Senior Divisional Engineers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(v) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(vi) Chief Engineer, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire North Eastern Railway.
(vii) Chief Bridge Engineer, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire North Eastern Railway.
(viii) Chief Track Engineer, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire North Eastern Railway.
(ix) Chief Engineer (Constn.), North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire North Eastern Railway.
(x) All Additional Chief Engineers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railways within their respective jurisdiction.
(xi) All Divisional Engineers, North Eastern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the North Eastern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(xii) Town Engineer, North Eastern Railway, Gorakhpur.	Premises under the administrative control of North Eastern Railway within his jurisdiction.
5. (i) All Senior Divisional Engineers, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northeast Frontier Railway within their respective jurisdiction.

1	2	1	2
(ii) All Divisional Railway Managers, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northeast Frontier Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	8. (i) Estate Officer, South Eastern Railway, Kharagpur	Premises under the administrative control of the South Eastern Railway situated within the local limits of Adra and Kharagpur Divisions including the areas of Garden Reach Shalimar and Santragachi of Kharagpur Divisional.
(iii) All Divisional Engineers, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northeast Frontier Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	(ii) Estate Officer, South Eastern Railway, Bilaspur.	Premises under the administrative control of the South Eastern Railway situated within the local limits of Bilaspur, Chakradharpur and Nagpur Divisions.
(iv) All Extra Divisional Executive Officers, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northeast Frontier Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	(iii) Estate Officer, South Eastern Railway, Waltair.	Premises under the administrative control of the South Eastern Railway situated within the local limits of Waltair and Khurda Road Divisions.
(v) All Additional Railway Managers, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Northeast Frontier Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	9. (i) All Divisional Railway Managers, Western Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Western Railways within their respective jurisdiction.
(vi) Deputy General Manager (G), Northeast Frontier Railway, Mallgaon.	Premises under the administrative control of the entire Northeast Frontier Railway.	(ii) All Senior Divisional Engineers, Western Railway/All Divisional Engineers, Western Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Western Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
6. (i) All Divisional Railway Managers, Southern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Southern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	(iii) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers, Western Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Western Railway within their respective jurisdiction.
(ii) All Additional Divisional Managers, Southern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Southern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	10. Deputy General Manager Chittaranjan Locomotive Works.	Premises under the administrative control of the Chittaranjan Locomotive Works.
(iii) All Additional Divisional Railway Managers (Technical) and All Additional Divisional Railway Managers (Operating) Southern Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the Southern Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	11. All Deputy Chief Mechanical Engineers, Deputy Chief Engineer and Principal Training School, Diesel Locomotive Works.	Premises under the administrative control of the Diesel Locomotive Works within their respective jurisdiction.
(iv) Additional Chief Engineer, Southern Railway, Golden Rock.	Premises under the administrative control of the Southern Railway situated within the local limit of Golden Rock Railway Colony area at Ponnalai bounded by Ambikapuram and Senthaniapuram on the north, Subramaniapuram and Ponnalaipottai on the west, Kilakalakanderkottai Mottepottu and Ponnalaipetti on the south and Kalakalkonderkottai on the east.	12. Chief Engineer and all Additional Chief Mechanical Engineers, Integral Coach Factory.	Premises under the administrative control of the Integral Coach Factory within their respective jurisdiction.
7. (i) All Divisional Railway Managers, South Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the South Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	13. Deputy Chief Engineer, Wheel and Axle Plant, Bangalore.	Premises under the administrative control of the Wheel and Axle Plant.
(ii) Senior Divisional Engineers and Divisional Engineers of Secunderabad (BG), Hyderabad (MG), Vijayawada, Hubli and Guntakal Division of South Central Railway.	Premises under the administrative control of the South Central Railway within their respective jurisdiction.	14. Deputy Chief Engineer, Diesel Component Works, Patiala.	Premises under the administrative control of the Diesel Component Works.
		15. Deputy General Manager, Metro Railway, Calcutta.	Premises under the control of metro railway situated within the limits of metropolitan city of Calcutta as defined in the Metro Railway (Construction of Works) Act, 1978 (33 of 1978).

[File No. 82/W2/14/4]
HIMMAT SINGH, Secy. Rly. Board
for and on behalf of President of India.

का० आ० 3081:—सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 के नियम 6 के अनुसरण में तथा भारत सरकार रेल मंत्रालय (रेलवे बोर्ड) की 15 जून, 1973 की अधिसूचना सां० आ० संख्या 1856 के अतिरिक्त में, केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा नीचे तालिका के कालम (j) में निर्दिष्ट राजपत्रित अधिकारियों को किसी भी समय या तो अपने ही प्रस्ताव पर या किसी ऐसे व्यक्ति जिसे सरकारी स्थान (अप्राधिकृत अधिभोगियों की बेदखली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) के अधीन नोटिस जारी किया गया हो, के प्रार्थनापत्र पर किसी संपदा अधिकारी के पास संबन्धित और उस तालिका के कालम 2 की तदनुसूची प्रविष्टि में विनिर्दिष्ट सरकारी स्थान से संबंधित किसी कार्यवाही को किसी दूसरे संपदा अधिकारी को स्थानान्तरित करने के लिए प्राधिकृत करती है।

तालिका

राजपत्रित अधिकारी	के नियंत्रणाधीन सरकारी स्थान
1	2
1. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, मध्य रेलवे	मध्य रेलवे
2. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, पूर्व रेलवे	पूर्व रेलवे
3. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, उत्तर रेलवे	उत्तर रेलवे
4. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे	पूर्वोत्तर रेलवे
5. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे	पूर्वोत्तर सीमा रेलवे
6. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, दक्षिण रेलवे	दक्षिण रेलवे
7. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे	दक्षिण मध्य रेलवे
8. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे	दक्षिण पूर्व रेलवे
9. वरिष्ठ उप महाप्रबंधक, पश्चिम रेलवे	पश्चिम रेलवे
10. महाप्रबंधक, चित्तरंजन रेल इंजन कारखाना, चित्तरंजन	चित्तरंजन रेल इंजन कारखाना
11. महाप्रबंधक, डीजल रेल इंजन कारखाना, वाराणसी	डीजल रेल इंजन कारखाना
12. महाप्रबंधक, सवारी डिब्बा कारखाना, मद्रास	सवारी डिब्बा कारखाना

[फाइल सं० 82/डब्ल्यू 2/14/4]

हिम्मत सिंह, सचिव, रेलवे बोर्ड

S.O. 3081.—In pursuance of rule 6 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Rules, 1971 and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board's) S.O. No. 1856 dated the 15th June, 1973, the Central Government hereby authorises the Gazetted Officers mentioned in column 1 of the Table below to transfer at any stage, either of his own motion or on application of any person to whom a notice under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971) has been served any proceedings pending before an Estate Officer to another Estate Officer and pertaining to public premises specified in the corresponding entry in column 2 thereof :—

TABLE

Gazetted Officers	Public Premises under the control of
1	2
1. Senior Deputy General Manager, Central Railway.	Central Railway
2. Senior Deputy General Manager, Eastern Railway.	Eastern Railway.
3. Senior Deputy General Manager, Northern Railway.	Northern Railway.
4. Senior Deputy General Manager, North eastern Railway.	Northeastern Railway.
5. Senior Deputy General Manager, Northeast Frontier Railway.	Northeast Frontier Railway.
6. Senior Deputy General Manager, Southern Railway.	Southern Railway.
7. Senior Deputy General Manager, South Central Railway.	South Central Railway.
8. Senior Deputy General Manager, South Eastern Railway.	South Eastern Railway.
9. Senior Deputy General Manager, Western Railway.	Western Railway.
10. General Manager, Chittaranjan Locomotive Works Chittaranjan	Chittaranjan Locomotive Works.
11. General Manager, Diesel Locomotive Works, Varanasi.	Diesel Locomotive Works.
12. General Manager, Integral Coach Factory, Madras.	Integral Coach Factory.

[F. No. 82/W2/14/4]

HIMMAT SINGH, Secy. Railway Board

भ्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय

(भ्रम विभाग)

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1983

का० आ० 3082:— केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह है राय कि इससे अप्रभावित अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में भारतीय स्टेट बैंक, बड़ौदा के प्रबंधन से सम्बन्धित औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब केन्द्रीय सरकार, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10

की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री जी० एस० बरोत होंगे, जिसका मुख्यालय अहमदाबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या क्षेत्रीय प्रबंधक, क्षेत्र III, बड़ोरा के नियंत्रण में के भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के प्रबंधतंत्र द्वारा नव-सारी शाखा के संबंध में श्री जी० डी० रावविकार, उप प्रधान-रोकड़िया को 30-1-1980 से उसकी सेवा से पदच्युत करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[एल-12012/173/82-डी० II(ए)]

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND REHABILITATION

(Department of Labour)

ORDER

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1983

S.O. 3082.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of India, Baroda and their workman in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an industrial Tribunal of which Shri G. S. Barot shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ahmedabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of India in relation to its Navsari Branch under control of the Regional Manager, Region-III, Baroda in dismissing Shri V. D. Ravavikar, Deputy Head Cashier from service with effect from 30-1-1980 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

[L-12012/173/82-D. IIA]

नई दिल्ली, 28 जून, 1983

का० आ० 3083 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में स्टेट बैंक आफ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर के प्रबंधतंत्र से सम्बन्धित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है ;

492 GI/83—8

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री महेंद्र भूषण शर्मा होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या स्टेट बैंक आफ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर की फालता शाखा के संबंध में उसके प्रबंधतंत्र की श्री आर० एल० जैन, लिपिक को सेवाएं 19-7-1972 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?”

[सं० एल-12012/239/82-डी० II(ए)]

New Delhi, the 28th June, 1983

S.O. 3083.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur and their workman in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bushan Sharma, shall be the Presiding Officer, with Headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur in relation to its Falna Branch in terminating the services of Shri R. L. Jain, Clerk with effect from 19-7-1972 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

[No. L-12012/239/82-D. II(A)]

का० आ० 3084 :—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में स्टेट बैंक आफ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर के प्रबंधतंत्र से संबंधित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है ;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना बांछनीय समझती है ;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7 क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का

प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पोशासन अधिकारी श्री महेंद्र भूषण शर्मा होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय जयपुर में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या स्टेट बैंक आफ बीकानेर एंड जयपुर की जेगूरपुर शाखा के संबंध में उसके प्रबंधन की श्री कमलकान्त अधीनस्थ स्टाफ की सेवाएं जनवरी 1976 से समाप्त करने की कार्यवाई न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो सम्बन्धित कर्मकार किस अनुसूची का हकदार है”

[संख्या एल-12012/246/82-डी० II(ए)]

एन० के० वर्मा, डेस्क अधिकारी

S.O. 3054.—Whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur and their workman in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri Mahendra Bushan Sharma shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Jaipur and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether action of the management of State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur, in relation to their Dungarpur Branch in terminating the services of Sri Kamal Kant Subordinate Staff in January, 1976 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

[No. L-12012/246/82-D. II (A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 27th July, 1983

S.O. 3055.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 22-7-83.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SINGLA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL,
NEW DELHI.

I.D. No. 60 of 1983

In the matter of disputes between :

Shri Satya Prakash, Sub-staff through U. P. Bank Employees Union, Kanpur.

Versus

State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur, Kanpur.

PRESENT :

Shri V. V. Mangalvedekar—for the workman.
Shri Surya Narain—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, on 25th January, 1982, vide Order No. L-12012/209/81-D. II(A) made the reference of the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of the State Bank of Bikaner and Jaipur in relation to their Birhana Road Branch, Kanpur in terminating the services of Shri Satya Prakash, Sub-staff with effect from 21-6-1980 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?”

2. Mr. Mangalvedekar appears for the Union of the workman, but cannot file the Statement of Claim for want of instructions from the workman. It appears that the workman is no longer interested in the dispute raised by him and it is presumed that he has lost interest in the present dispute.

3. Accordingly a ‘No Dispute Award’ is made in the present case.

July 5, 1983.

[No. L-12012/209/81-D. II(A)]

O. P. SINGLA, Presiding Officer

S.O. 3056.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Allahabad Bank, Lucknow and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 21-7-83.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SINGLA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, NEW
DELHI.

I. D. No. 79 of 1981

In the matter of disputes between :

Shri Rajinder Kumar Singh through Shri P. N. Singh,
Allahabad Bank, Mall Road, Kanpur

AND

Allahabad Bank, Aminabad, Lucknow.

PRESENT :

Shri R. P. Srivastava—for the Management.

Shri V. V. Mangalvedekar—for the workman.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, on 23rd June, 1981 vide Order No. L-12012/318/80-D. II. A made the reference of the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

“Whether the action of the management of Allahabad Bank Aminabad, Lucknow in terminating the services of Shri Rajinder Kumar Singh, temporary peon-cum-farrash with effect from 12-12-1979 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled to?”

2. Shri V. V. Mangalvedekar appeared for the workman on 12-8-1981 and 29-12-1981, but the workman never appeared. Today, also Mr. Vedekar is present, but cannot

file the Statement of Claim for want of instructions from the workman. It appears that the workman has lost interest in the dispute raised by him and accordingly, a 'No Dispute Award' is made.

July 6, 1983.

O. P. SINGLA, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12012/318/80-D. II(A)]

N. K. VERMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

S.O. 3087.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Mineral Exploration Corporation Ltd., Camp-Basdeopur and their workmen.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 68 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Minerals Exploration Corporation Limited, Camp Basdeopur, P. O. Bansjora, Dist. Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Manoranjan Prasad (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri R. S. Murty, Advocate.

For the Workman.—None.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 20th June, 1983

AWARD

By Order No. L-29011/38/80-D. III. B., dated, the 15th December, 1981, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :—

"Whether the action of the Project Manager, Basdeopur Camp of Messrs Mineral Exploration Corporation Limited, P.O. Bansjora, Dist. Dhanbad in terminating the services of Shri Bal Bahadur, Watchman with effect from 3rd May, 1979 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The case of the management is that the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, was employed from 1.12.1976 as a Watchman on a purely temporary basis on daily wages of Rs. 4.50 at Camp Talgoria by the Officer-in-charge at the said Camp. The work at the said camp was completed by about February/March, 1978, but, since Bal Bahadur was willing to work at Basdeopur, the management agreed to continue his employment and shifted him to Basdeopur Camp on the same terms and conditions on purely temporary basis. In the night of 1.5.79 it was reported to the Project Manager of Basdeopur Camp that at about 10.30 p.m. Bal Bahadur was committing unnatural sexual intercourse with a bitch in the room which was witnessed by other employees at the Camp and when those employees accosted him he threatened to kill them with a stick whereupon the employees at the Camp disarmed him the Project Manager thereupon appointed a Committee of five persons, namely, (1) Shri P. Sinha, Geologist, (2) R.S. Bharaj, ADE Incharge,

(3) D. C. Shah, Geologist, (4) S.S. Pandey, Store Clerk and (5) P.C. Negi, Joint Secretary, M.E.C.E.U. to enquire into the said incident. The said Committee made an enquiry into the matter from the employees of the Camp who had witnessed the incident and the Committee vide its report dated 2.5.79 recommended that the presence of Bal Bahadur in the Camp will destroy the discipline, peace, and harmony of all the inmates of the Camp and as such he should be removed. In view of the enraged feelings of the workers of the Camp, immediate action was taken by the Project Manager, and after taking into consideration the report of the said Committee, the Project Manager vide his order dated 3.5.79 terminated the services of Bal Bahadur with effect from the forenoon of 3.5.1979. The management submits that it was perfectly justified in terminating the services of Bal Bahadur and that it is ready to prove his said misconduct before this Tribunal for which permission may be granted to it.

3. The case of the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, is that he had incurred displeasure of Sri P.C. Negi, the self-styled Joint Secretary, M.E.C.E.U, as he had failed to satisfy his greed and the management took the above action against him on the basis of a report from the said Sri P. C. Negi which was false and motivated. It is also his case that no chargesheet was issued by the management to him nor there was any departmental enquiry into the charge nor he was personally heard before issuing the order of termination of his service which was purely arbitrary, malafide, illegal and in violation of the principle of natural justice. He has, therefore, prayed that the reference may be answered in his favour and he be reinstated with back wages.

4. After the filing of the written statements by the parties, however, Sri. B. N. Sharma, Joint General Secretary of the sponsoring union, the Janta Mazdoor Sangh, who had signed the written statement on behalf of the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, filed a petition on 19-5-83 stating that the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, who was a Nepali Watchman, is traceless for the last two years and his address is not available and in his absence it is not possible to proceed with the case, and made a prayer in the petition that a 'no dispute' award or any other order may be passed for the disposal of the case, and thereafter he withdrew from this case, and consequently the case was subsequently taken up ex-parte in which Sri Pankaj Sinha (MW-1) and Sri Amarendra Thakur (MW-2) were examined and three documents were also proved and marked Exts. M-1, M-2 and M-3.

5. Amarendra Thakur (MW-2) has deposed that he was working as Drill Helper under the management since 1-6-77 and in 1979 he was posted at Basdeopur Camp where the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, was working as a watchman. He has further deposed that on 1-5-79 at about 10.30 p.m. in the night Bal Bahadur was found committing unnatural sexual intercourse with a bitch in a room which was witnessed by him and several other workmen present there and on seeing them Bal Bahadur had tried to assault them with a danda which was, however, snatched away by them and this incident was reported to the Camp Incharge, Sri Nath. Sri Pankaj Sinha (MW-2) who is at present holding the post of Senior Geologist and who was posted in the year 1979 at Basdeopur Camp at Dhanbad as Geologist, has deposed that the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, was a contingent worker who was working at the Camp as a watchman, and on 1-5-79 at about 10.30 p.m. in the night there was some halla and some workmen came and reported to the Project Manager, Sri N. J. Nath, that Bal Bahadur had been found committing unnatural sexual intercourse with a bitch and thereupon Sri Nath tried to pacify the

workers and told them that he would look into the matter and he constituted an enquiry committee consisting of Sri Pankaj Sinha (WW-1), Sri Bharaj, Asstt. Drilling Engineer, Sri D. C. Sah, Geologist, Sri S. S. Pandey, Store Keeper and Sri P. C. Negi, Drill workman and Union Secretary to enquire into the matter and report. He has further deposed that the members of the Enquiry Committee held an enquiry on the following day and recorded the statements of the witnesses and thereafter submitted the enquiry report dated 2-5-79 holding the concerned workman guilty. He has proved the enquiry report dated 2-5-79 which is signed by him and other members of the enquiry committee and the same has been marked as Ext. M-1. According to him, the enquiry report was given to the Project Manager, Sri N. J. Nath, who removed Bal Bahadur from service as other workers were dissatisfied with his act which had created tension. He has proved the order dated 3-5-79 (Ext. M-2) of Sri N. J. Nath terminating the services of Bal Bahadur with effect from the forenoon of 3-5-79. He has also proved another Office Memo dated 31-10-77 (Ext. M-3) signed by Sri N. J. Nath, Project Manager, asking Bal Bahadur to explain as to why disciplinary action should not be taken against him for an earlier act of indecent misbehaviour with the wife of one Sri Chogalal, D.T. II on 31-10-77. A copy of the Standing Orders of the company has also been filed in this case and under item No. (xxxii) of Clause 29 indecent behaviour within the premises of the establishment is also an act of misconduct which may entail removal or dismissal from service under Clause 30 of the Standing Orders.

6. From the aforesaid ex-parte evidence adduced on behalf of the management, the misconduct alleged against the concerned workman, Bal Bahadur, stands fully established, which justifies termination of his service, and hence it must be held that the action of the management in terminating his service with effect from 3-5-79 is justified. The reference is answered accordingly, but, in the circumstances of the case, there will be no order as to cost.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer

[No. L-29011/38/80-D. III. B]

S. S. BHALLA, Under Secy.

New Delhi, the 23rd July, 1983

S.O. 3388.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 8th July 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA

Reference No. 31 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Calcutta Port Trust, Calcutta;

AND

Their workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of management—Mr. D. K. Mukherjee, Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of workmen—Mr. Ashoko Bhattacharya, General Secretary of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal. INDUSTRY : Port Trust,

AWARD

The following dispute was sent to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Government of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. L-32012/4/82-D.IV(A) dated 25th August, 1982 :

"Whether the action of the management of the Calcutta Port Trust in employing Shri Radha Krishna Jana as Night Guard at Dadan Patra Bar (Midnapur) Hi-Fix Station since 1971 without regularising him in the post of Night Guard and not paying him wages as per scale of pay of Watchman or Night Guard is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The whole case of the management of the Calcutta Port Trust is that Radha Krishna Jana had been employed w.e.f. 29th July, 1971 at his own request on contract basis to guard their properties and to save them from theft at night on the Hi-Fix station at Dadanpatrabar in the Midnapore district of West Bengal at the rate of Rs. 125 per month (later increased to Rs. 200 from January, 1978) that it was a contract for service and not a contract of service. Sri D. K. Mukherjee appearing for the Board argues that engagement of Sri Jana was in fact in the nature of private or personal employment and though he had a calling or occupation since 1971, it cannot be said that his engagement was that of an industrial worker, that there was no post of Night Guard, that he was not appointed in any vacancy or in any existing post in the establishment under the Board and that the time of his engagement, no vacancy for the post of Night Guard was notified to the appropriate employment exchange nor was any advertisement/circular issued. It is said that he was engaged without any letter of appointment, that his age was also above the age limit prescribed for Class IV posts under the Board and he was simply picked up following his offer to guard the properties of the Board at the instant Unit (i.e. at Dadanpatrabar Station) of the Chief Hydraulic Engineers' Department. He further says that the contractual payment of Rs. 125.00 P or Rs. 200.00 P, as the case may be, was subject to deductions in the event of his failure to perform his duties; his name is not borne on muster roll nor does his name appear in the register or regular establishment of the instant Unit of the department; unlike regular staff of the Board, no duty hour had been specified for him, he was free to take up any other work during his spare time and he was also free to undertake similar contractual jobs at night for other organisations and to manage them by his own man and resources. Sri Mukherjee contends that while regular staff of the Board were paid their salaries/wages through the salary bills, Sri Jana is being always paid by the Station-in-Charge of Dadanpatrabar against the G-20 Bills and unlike regular staff of the Board, the conditions of engagement of Sri Jana are not governed by any departmental rules having statutory force nor by the Fundamental Rules of the Government of India. It is pointed out that Sri Jana is also not required to sign any attendance register. On these grounds it is urged that Sri Jana not having been employed by the Board as other regular staff has no claim for regularisation of his service in the post of night guard nor can he have any claim to the pay scale of watchman or night guard. On the other hand Sri Asoke Bhattacharya the General Secretary of the Calcutta Port Trust Workers' Union has submitted that Radha Krishna Jana was appointed by the CHE as night guard with the consent of local panchayat in 1971 at a salary of Rs. 125 per month which was increased to Rs. 200 per month in the year 1978 and he was thus a fullfledged regular employee of the Calcutta Port Trust in the Chief Hydraulic Engineer's department and hence he was entitled to the scale of pay of other regular staff. It is pointed out that in 1971 Sri Jana was paid night guard allowance by CHE through pay acquittance roll and later directly by the CHE. His submission is that it was a contract of service.

3. On a consideration of the submission of the parties I am of opinion that Radha Krishna Jana was an employee of the Calcutta Port Trust and that he was not a contractor. The submission of Sri Mukherjee is not acceptable. He rendered personal service as night guard on a fixed amount of salary from the year 1971. He has been serving the CHE's department for 12 years as watchman. His service

was under the control of the management. He could be dismissed by the management. His salary was increased by the management. The management had full control and supervision over his work. He was initially brought by a peon of the management, named Harekrishna Maity for appointment (vide Ext. M-1 and W-1). His details and L11 were taken by the management. He was sent to the site with a peon. The payment of Rs. 200 to him from 1978 was sanctioned by the Administration (vide Ext M-2 and M-3). There is absolutely no material for coming to the conclusion that Sri Jana was a contractor and not a servant. The above circumstances indicate that he was an employee under the Chief Hydraulic Engineer of the Calcutta Port Trust. He never entered into any contract service as an independent contractor. Sri Mukherjee replied on two letters Ext. W-1 dated 28 July, 1971 and Ext. M-1 dated 29 July, 1971 for supporting his contentions that it was a contract for service. In my opinion he is wrong. By Ext. W-1 the peon Harekrishna Maity was directed to engage a night guard at a remuneration of Rs. 125 per month. Ext. M-1 shows that Maity brought Radha Krishna Jana of 43 years age, a local man for such appointment as a night guard. These two letters by no stretch of imagination show that it was a contract for employment. The argument is rejected.

4. Shri D.K. Mukherjee for the management strenuously urged that there was no post to which he could be appointed. The point has no force. It is the management who has right to create a post. It may be noted that there are two types of industrial dispute. Those about the negotiation of new and improve terms of employment (dispute of interest) and those about the interpretation, application and enforcement of existing terms (dispute of right). The present dispute is a dispute of interest. In such a case the Industrial Tribunal can create new obligation and new rights between the parties. If there is no post, it is the duty of the management in the facts and circumstances of the case to create a post for Radha Krishna Jana whom they appointed in 1971 and from whom they have been taking service up-to-day and are likely to take service in future also. Moreover I think that by appointing him as night guard, it will be presumed that a post of night guard was created at the site. So the contention has no merit.

5. Shri Mukherjee next argued that Radha Krishna Jana had been employed at the age of 43 years on 29 July, 1971 (vide Ext M-1) and this shows that he being over-age, could not have been employed as a regular staff. Suffice to say that even if it was not regular, it should now be regularised. His work is of permanent nature. Undoubtedly he has been continuing in service for years. Hence Social Justice demands that Sri Jana should now be regularised in his service as night guard. The Union submits that Sri Jana should be allowed to work as a regular watchman from the date of his joining and also to pay all his back dues. The prayer cannot be allowed. Regularisation or payment cannot be from a back date. It cannot be retrospective. This prayer of the Union is rejected.

6. It was next contended by Sri Mukherjee that the matter of regularisation was not covered either by Schedule II or Schedule III of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 and hence this tribunal had no jurisdiction to decide it. Suffice to say that the matter is covered by item No. 6 of Schedule II. The contention is rejected.

7. In conclusion my award is that the action of the management of the Calcutta port Trust in employing Sri Radha Krishna Jana as night guard at Dadanpatrabar (Midnapore) Hi-Fix Station since 1971 without regularising him in the post of night guard and not paying his wages as per scale of pay of watchman or nightguard is not justified. In my opinion the concerned workman Radha Krishna Jana is entitled to be regularised in the post of night guard. He is also entitled to the scale of pay of night guard as may be admissible to him as per rules of the Calcutta Port Trust

from the date of regularisation. The regularisation must be done within one month of the notification of this award.

Dated, Calcutta.

The 1st July, 1983.

M.P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-32012/4/82/D-IV (A)]

S.O. 3089.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, No. II Bombay in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Shri Joao J. Rodrigues, Owner of Launch ML Seamaster and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th July, 1983

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 2, BOMBAY

Reference No. CGIT-2/9 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to Shri Joao J Rodrigues, Owner of Launch 'ML Seamaster'

AND

Their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri S. N. N. Karmali, Advocate.

For the workmen—1. Shri A. D'Costa, Advocate, 2. Shri S. V. Rao, Goa Labour Union.

INDUSTRY : Ports and Docks

STATE : Goa, Daman and Diu

Bombay, dated the 2nd July, 1983

AWARD

By their order No.L-36011/11/83/DIV(A) dated the 28th February, 1983 the Central Government referred the following dispute for adjudication under Section 10 (1) (d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947:—

"Whether the action of Shri Joao J. Rodrigues, Owner of Launch 'ML Seamaster' in stopping Shri Simao Rodrigues from work with effect from 6-4-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled?"

2. Despite notices to the parties neither the Union nor the management filed statement of claim or written statement, and the reason behind the same as stated by Shri S.V. Rao, who is representing the workman is that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties whereby the workman Shri Simao Rodrigues has accepted all the dues in full and total satisfaction of his claim and nothing remains payable. Shri S.N.N. Karmali endorses that statement. Therefore since the matter is amicably settled though out of Court the reference cannot survive and hence disposed of.

Award accordingly. No order as to costs.

M.A. DESHPANDE, Presiding Officer

[No. L-36011/11/82-D-IV (A)]

S.O. 3090.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, New Delhi in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the managements of Food Corporation of India and their workmen which was received by the Central Government on the 13th July, 1983.

BEFORE SHRI O. P. SINGLA, PRESIDING OFFICER,
CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

NEW DELHI

I. D. No. 117 of 1981

In the matter of disputes.

BETWEEN :

Shri Raghbir Singh through Secretary, Bhartiya Khadya Nigam Karamchari Sangh, Uttar Pradesh Hapur.

AND

Food Corporation of India, Hazrat Ganj, Lucknow, U.P.

PRESENT :

Mr. Raghbir Singh with Mr. Shamsheer Singh Secretary, Bhartiya Khadya Nigam Karamchari Sangh.

Mr. R. A. Prasad—for the Management.

AWARD

The Central Government, Ministry of Labour, on 13th August, 1981, vide Order No. L-42012/14/81/FCI/D.IV(A), made the reference of the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication:—

"Whether the action of the management of Food Corporation of India, Lucknow in retiring Shri Raghbir Singh, Head Watchman, with effect from the 9th July, 1980, instead of the 31st January, 1981 is legal and justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workman entitled?"

2. The matter has been voluntarily and amicably settled between the parties on the following terms and conditions : —

- "1. That the management will pay full wages with all allowances for the period 10-7-80 to 31-1-81.
2. That the G.P.F. funds to the credit of the workman will be recommended for release, if not already paid.
3. That the Gratuity and pension payment as per rules admissible to the workman will also be recommended for payment, treating his service upto 31-1-81, for the purpose of this benefits.
4. That this settlement is full and final to all the disputes/demands raised by the workman so far, to his entire satisfaction. The workman will not agitate/claim for any damages/loss cost suffered or incurred by him.
5. That if any interim payments are made to him subsequent to present date of retirement, those amounts should be deducted."

3. The terms of settlement aforesaid are fair and proper and are incorporated in this award and an award in terms of the aforesaid terms and conditions of settlement is made which will govern the dispute referred to this Tribunal and a direction is made accordingly for observance of terms and conditions aforesaid by the parties.

O. P. SINGLA, Presiding Officer

June 21, 1983.

[No. L-42012/14/81/FCI/D.IV(A)]

R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 29th July, 1983.

S.O. 3091.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Calcutta in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Grindlays Bank Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL
CALCUTTA

Reference No. 12 of 1983

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Grindlays Bank Limited.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. C. Krishnamurthi, Manager, Industrial Relations, with Mr. N. V. Srinivasan, Industrial Relations Officer.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. Ajit Banerjee, President of the Union.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Banking

AWARD

By Order No. L-12011(4)/82-D.IV(A) dated 20th January, 1983 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Grindlays Bank Ltd., Calcutta, in posting Shri Deo Narayan Pandey, a junior subordinate staff to the post of Head Peon, ignoring the claim of S/Shri Ram Chandra Prasad and Prem Bahadur Chetri with effect from 1-1-1982 is justified? If not, to what relief is the concerned workmen entitled?"

2. The previous Head Peon Bhowani Prasad Pandey was working in the Shambazar branch of the Grindlays Bank. He retired from service from 1 January 1982. Undisputably he was the Head peon. After his retirement the management entrusted the duty of the Head peon to Dev Narayan Pandey on permanent basis whose appointment has been challenged in the instant case mainly on the ground that the appointment was not made on the basis of seniority. Sri Ajit Banerjee, the President of the Union, appearing for the union has raised several contentions challenging the appointment of Deo Narayan Pandey as head peon. His first contention is that the management should have a senior subordinate staff to the post of head peon on the basis of seniority and Ram Chandra Prasad being admittedly the senior-most sub-staff by about 11 years to Deo Narayan Pandey should have been posted to the post of Head peon which carries a special allowance. In my opinion the contention has no merit in the facts and circumstances of this case. Admittedly there is no rule or regulation or any provision in any bipartite settlement that seniority must be considered in the matter of appointment of head peon. In absence of any such rule, I think, the management can appoint any person as head peon whom they consider suitable. The matter has been settled by a decision in Grindlays Bank Ltd. and Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal, 1978 11 LLJ 462 (Cal.). In that case His Lordship Sabyasachi Mukherjee observed at page 466 : "In my opinion, it is indisputable that in absence of any rule controlling promotion or selection, the management has the power to select or promote anyone it chooses. The management however is not free to act in a manner which can be described as mala fide or victimisation or unfair labour practice." I may also quote here the following observation of Justice Sinha in the case of Royal Calcutta Golf Club v. Third Industrial Tribunal & Ors., 1960 1 LLJ 464 (Cal.) at page 467 : "A person has the right to reorganise his business in any fashion he likes, for the purpose of economy or convenience, and nobody is entitled to tell him how he should conduct his business. The only limitation is that he should do it bona fide and not for the purpose of victimising his employee...." In the present case admittedly there is no rule as already stated, governing the appointment of head peon. It is clear therefore that the management had power to select any person of their choice for that post whom they considered suitable for the job. The only thing to be seen is whether the act of the management can be described as mala fide or victimisation or unfair labour practice.

3. Sri Ajit Banerjee argues that the act of the management was mala fide of unfair labour practice and victimisation because the act of supersession was done only to humiliate the Grindlays Bank Employees Association whose members are Ram Chandra Prasad and Prem Bahadur Chetri whereas Deo Narain Pandey the younger brother of Bhawani Prasad Pandey (the retired head peon) is a member of the rival union, namely, the Grindlays Bank Employees Union which according to the bank is a recognised union. It is urged that this Union enjoyed favour of the branch Manager of the Shambazar branch of the bank. Sri Banerjee points out that Ram Chandra Prasad admittedly officiated in the post of head peon on 15 or 16 occasions in between 1976 and 1981 and that Prem Bahadur Chetri also had officiated on 2 or 3 occasions (vide MW-1, P. Nandy) whereas Deo Narain Pandey had never officiated or acted as head peon and so the management unjustifiably showed naked favouritism to Deo Narain Pandey ignoring the rightful claim of Ram Chandra Prasad and Prem Bahadur Chetri. My attention was drawn to the letter of these two peons (Annexure A dated 2 January 1981 and Annexure B dated 12 January 1982 respectively) expressing their grievances in this regard. In my opinion there is no substance in these contentions. The very fact that in spite of the presence of Deo Narain Pandey in the office, the management assigned the duty of head peon on officiating basis to Ram Chandra Prasad about 15 or 16 times and to Prem Bahadur Chetri 2 or 3 times goes to show that there was no malice on the part of the management. MW 1 P. Nandy, the Manager of Shambazar branch of the bank in his evidence has made the position very clear. He has stated that he had assigned such duty to them because it was only on temporary basis and not on permanent basis and in doing so he had also regard for seniority. Now, the present appointment was admittedly made on permanent basis. Regarding Ram Chandra Prasad MW 1 has deposed that he had some chronic ailment, that he was not co-operative and sometimes questioned to the allotted job to the management staff and on one occasion he did not even remove the books of account to book-safe which was his normal duty without intimating the officer. In his cross-examination the witness has said that he had entrusted Ram Chandra Prasad to act as head peon in place of Deo Narain Pandey from 6 June, 1983 (see Ext. W 2 also) but he fell sick and so he had to assign that duty to Prem Bahadur Chetri for two days (see Ext W-1) during the illness of Ram Chandra Prasad. Regarding Prem Bahadur Chetri, he has deposed that he was appointed as Watchman and could not properly understand the instructions given by the officers and that he was short of hearing. The witness has clearly said that the performance of these people was being closely observed by him. As regards Deo Narain Pandey, he has deposed that he has the initiative to do the job, he was co-operative and possessed good health, that whenever any work was entrusted to him, he performed the work perfectly and to the satisfaction of the officer. In cross-examination he has stated that Deo Narain Pandey was attending to the clearing job from Shambazar branch and was also doing collection peon's job and other outside job as required by the branch. The union took out in his cross-examination that he had not issued any letter to Ram Chandra Prasad for non-compliance with management's order on one occasion but the witness has given the reply that they were sympathetic to him and no letter was issued. In my opinion the witness is reliable. His evidence is convincing and truthful. I rely on his evidence. Now, in view of this evidence, can it be said that the management acted mala fide? The answer must be in the negative. It is a well-established principle of law that the burden of establishing mala fides lies very heavily on the person who alleges it. Considering all the allegations and submissions of the Union in regard thereto, I think, they cannot be considered as sufficient to establish mala fides animus. On the contrary, the evidence of manager, MW 1, Sri P. Nandy clearly proves that the management acted bona fide considering all the pros and cons of the matter. It was not an act of victimisation because neither Ram Chandra nor Prem Bahadur Chetri was made victim of any unfair and arbitrary action. One was suffering from chronic ailment, another was short of hearing. Not only that, their performance was closely being observed by the branch manager MW 1 P. Nandy. Sri Banerjee referred to the decision in *Workmen of M/s. Williamson Magor & Co. Ltd. v. M/s Williamson Magor & Co. Ltd.*, 1982 Lab IC 33 : AIR 1982 SC 78, but that was a case of unjustified promotions of

some junior persons superseding without reason or necessity, a large number of senior persons and so malice in law and effectual victimisation were obvious. The present is not a case of promotion. It is a case of selection. The present case is covered by the principles laid down in the case of *Grindlays Bank Ltd. v. Central Govt. Industrial Tribunal*, 1978 (2) LLJ 462 (Cal.). In that case also the bank had posted a junior staff to the post or draftily overlooking the claim of a senior sub-staff. It was held that the Tribunal had no justification to interfere with the selection of the management. The argument that the management had acted in a mala fide manner or in a manner which could be described as unfair labour practice or victimisation was rejected because there was no evidence that the management had acted in order to curb any trade union activities or in order to punish any workman for his trade union activities. Here also there is no such evidence. On the contrary, the evidence is otherwise which I have already referred to. It is to be noticed that neither Ram Chandra Prasad nor Chetri has examined himself. The union has not examined any witness. There is thus no oral evidence on behalf of the union. The union has not placed any documentary evidence to show that the management acted in a mala fide manner. They have filed three documents Exts. W1, W2 and W3. By Ext. W2 Ram Chandra Prasad was asked to officiate from 6th June, 1983 until Deo Narain Pandey returned. By Ext. W 1 Prem Bahadur Chetri was asked to officiate for two days from 7th June, 1983 to 8th June, 1983. Ext. W-3 is the letter of the management to ALC (C), Calcutta dated 16th February, 1982 stating that they had right to select Deo Narain Prasad as head peon. By Ext. M-1 the Union raised the dispute with the management. Thus there is no evidence on record, oral or documentary, of any mala fides or victimisation or of unfair labour practice. I therefore hold that the Union has failed to establish mala fide or victimisation or unfair labour practice.

3. Sri A. Banerjee next argued that suitability of Deo Narain for the job of head peon could not be judged when he had never acted or officiated as such. In my opinion the argument is not valid. Capability or suitability of a person for a particular job can, I think, be judged from other performances of his and also from other factors as well, for example, from willingness to obey, taking initiative etc., though the particular work for which he is selected has not been performed by him earlier. So, the point has no force.

4. Sri Banerjee next urged that the Bank has not followed their own usage, custom, convention and practice in the case of posting of head peon for filling up vacancies on the basis of seniority. He drew my attention to para 10 of the written statement of the Union where some names of sub-staff who were appointed as head peons in Calcutta main branch (19 Netaji Subhas Road) and Chowringhee Road branch. Suffice to say that the Bank has not accepted those statements and no one from the side of the union has come to the witness box to prove them. On a mere statement of this type and without any evidence on record it cannot be held that it was the usage, custom, convention and practice of the bank to fill up vacancies in the posts of head peons on the basis of seniority. My attention was also drawn to the evidence in cross-examination of MW-1, where he said that in assigning the officiating duty to Ram Chandra Prasad or Prem Bahadur Chetri he had regard to seniority but the witness has said that it was merely on temporary basis. That cannot prove custom or practice. The contention is rejected.

5. In the result, I hold that the action of the management of Grindlays Bank, p l c, Calcutta in posting Deo Narain Pandey a Junior subordinate staff to the post of head peon ignoring the claim of Ram Chandra Prasad and Prem Bahadur Chetri with effect from 1st January, 1982 is invalid. It follows that the workmen concerned are not entitled to any relief. This is my award.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 2nd July, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-12011/4/82-D. IV (A)]

R. K. GUPTA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

S.O. 3092.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kooridih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sonardih, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

PRESENT:

Shri J. P. Singh, Presiding Officer.

Reference No. 52 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S.10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Kooridih colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited Post Office Sonardih, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary Rastriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, 1st July, 1983

AWARD

This is an industrial dispute under S.10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-20012(15)/82-D.III(A) dated 11th May, 1982 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Kooridih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sonardih, Govindpur Area, District Dhanbad for proper categorisation of Shri Govind Singh as Chainman is justified? If so, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled?"

2. The case of the concerned workman Shri Govind Singh is that he has been employed in Kooridih colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., in a permanent vacancy as Chainman since 1979. He has been however designated as survey mazdoor and is being accordingly paid category I time rate of wages. As chainman in the survey department of the colliery he is entitled to higher rate of wages in time scale in monthly rated grade F in the technical and supervisory staff. The concerned workman is suffering due to this action of the management in paying him category I wages instead of Grade F and is a deviation from the schedule of wage rate giving loss to him. The concerned workman represented before the management several time and ultimately his union viz. Rastriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh raised an industrial dispute. Due to the adamant attitude of the management there was failure of conciliation and so the dispute has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication

3. The case of the management, on the other hand, is that the concerned workman Shri Govind Singh is a survey mazdoor and he has been performing the duties of survey mazdoor. But the management has admitted that in the course of his duties in the survey department the concerned workman has learnt the job of chainman, and he was given opportunity to work as chainman during certain period by the surveyor to help him go gain experience on the job of chainman. According to the management the surveyor allowed him to handle survey instrument unofficially to learn the job of a chainman. According to the management the strength of chainman in the colliery is more than the requirement to assist the surveyor in carrying the jobs and there was no necessity for him to engage survey mazdoor as chainman.

The management has also said that the concerned workman was given chance to work as chainman unauthorisedly for a few months and an attempt was made subsequently at the colliery level to get him appointed as chainman. But the matter was examined at the area level which revealed that there are already 3 chainmen at the colliery at the relevant time and there was not necessity of engaging the concerned workman as chairman. The surveyor, however, initiated a note sheet for appointing the concerned workman as chairman. Such tactics of the concerned workman with the connivance of the colliery officials were disapproved at the area level and the surveyor was advised not to indulge in such practice in future. The positive case of the management is that no vacancy exists in the colliery to appoint the concerned workman as chainman and there is no scope for the concerned workman to work as chainman. Under these circumstances the prayer of the management is that the workman should not be granted any relief.

4. In support of his case the concerned workman, Shri Govind Singh, WW.1 has given his evidence. He was employed in Kooridih colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. for the first time on 4-10-1971 as a spray mazdoor in which capacity he worked for about 3 years. Thereafter he became survey mazdoor in the same colliery. When he joined the survey department there were 2 permanent chainmen viz. Shri Sheopujan Sonar and Shri Kanu Lal. After about one year therefrom Shri Munna Rabidas was posted as chainman from the area office. Shri Kanu Lal was given the job of tracer sometime in the end of 1979. The management of the colliery thereafter asked him to work as chainman from 1-1-1980 and since then he is still working as chainman. These facts deposed by him in his evidence has not been controverted by MW. 1. Shri J. Upadhyaya, who is working in Kooridih colliery for about two years and 9 months as Safety officer. He holds the position next to the manager, and whenever the manager goes on leave he works as manager. He has said that there are 3 chainmen and 3 survey mazdoors in his colliery under one surveyor, but previously there were 2 surveyors. His evidence is that with one surveyor one chainman and one survey mazdoor are required. In his colliery there is no necessity of regularising Shri Govind Singh as chainman.

5. In support of his case a number of documents have been filed on behalf of the concerned workman. Ext. W.1 is a photostate copy of his petition dated 20-7-81. In this petition the concerned workman put forth a case before the management that since he was working as chainman for the past 3 years and was still continuing to get wages of category I mazdoor, he should be designated as chainman and allowed to draw the wages of chainman. On this application there is a note by the surveyor that during his service the applicant learnt the work of chainman and has been doing the work of chainman satisfactorily. The colliery manager also recommended his case to the General Manager, Area No. III giving the following note:

"As he is doing the job of chainman as certified by the surveyor he may be properly categorised as chainman".

There appears to be a further note recommending approval of the recommendation. Thereafter there does not appear to be any final order. But this document shows that the management of the colliery accepted that the concerned workman was working as chainman for the past three years. The positive evidence of the concerned workman (WW. 1) is that the job of chainman was given to him from 1-1-1980 because one of the chainman Shri Kanu Lal was promoted to the post of tracer towards the end of 1979. MW.1 who is at present working as manager of Kooridih colliery has given no counter evidence on this point. He has not supported his evidence by any paper that there is only one surveyor and the requirement is of only one chainman. Moreover, if there is requirement of only one chainman, how the colliery is having three chainmen as deposed by him. On the other hand, the evidence of WW. 1 is that in the colliery the strength of chainman has always been three and since one was elevated to the job of tracer, the concerned workman was given the chance to work as chainman regularly from 1-1-1980. At the time of evidence of MW.1 one joining report was shown to MW.1 who admitted it to be genuine and signed

by the colliery manager. Shri Govind Singh the concerned workman who was allowed to join as chainman from 15-6-83 at the expiry of sick leave from 8-6-83 to 14-6-83. This document has been marked Ext. W.2 on admission by MW.1 and it is dated 15-6-83. This document shows that between 8-6-83 and 14-6-83 the concerned workman was treated to be on leave as chainman and on 16-6-83 he was permitted to join as chainman. This document has been filed to controvert the case of the management that the surveyor was warned to have permitted the concerned workman to work as chainman and therefore the concerned workman was not working as chainman. Ext. W.2 shows that even in the month of June, 1983 the concerned workman has continued to work as chainman. Furthermore, the management has not filed by document to show that the area office has taken exception to the conduct of the colliery management in allowing the concerned workman to work as chainman. The position therefore is that the management has not proved by any evidence the assertion made in the written statement. On the other hand, the workman has proved through Ext. W.1 and his own evidence that he has been working as chainman from 1-1-1980 and his case was duly recommended by the surveyor, the colliery manager, etc. to regularise him in the job of chainman. Since it was not done the present dispute has arisen. But in support of the dispute the concerned workman till about a fortnight back from now has been working as chainman.

6. Shri B. Joshi, Advocate appearing on behalf of the management has accepted the assertion made on behalf of the workman that the concerned workman has been working as chainman. He has however, argued against the case of regularisation of the concerned workman. Shri S. Bose, appearing on behalf of the workman has said that in the Schedule of the reference there is no mention that the concerned workman should be regularised as chainman. The schedule shows that the demand of the workman is for proper categorisation of Shri Govind Singh as chainman. The issue is therefore very simple. The management of the colliery is taking work of chainman from the concerned workman from 1-1-1980 continuously and even at present he is working as chainman. In all fairness the concerned workman as chainman should have got his wages in grade F of technical and supervisory grade. Since the concerned workman is working as chainman for such a long time, there is no reason why he should not be paid for the job he is doing and so the demand as made in the schedule of the reference for being placed in Grade F of the technical and supervisory grade is only proper and justified.

7. Thus, having considered all aspects of the case this reference is answered as below:

The demand of the workmen of Kooridih colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Sonardih, Govindpur Area, District Dhanbad for proper categorisation of Shri Govind Singh as Chainman is justified. Consequently, Shri Govind Singh, the concerned workman is entitled to be placed in Grade F of the supervisory and technical staff with effect from 1-1-1980 and he will be entitled to the difference in wages and other emoluments from 1-1-1980.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012(15)/82-D.III(A)]

S.O. 3093.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Phularitand Colliery Barora Area No. I of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th July, 1983.

492 GI/83—9

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the
Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

Reference No. 78 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Phularitand Colliery in Barora Area No. I of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Manoranjan Prasad (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. Bose, Secretary, Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, dated, the 7th July, 1983

AWARD

The present reference arises out of Order No. L-20012-(232)/82-D.III(A) dated, the 30th November, 1982 passed by the Central Government in respect of an industrial dispute between the parties mentioned above. The subject matter of the dispute has been specified in the schedule to the said order and the said schedule runs as follows :—

"Whether the demand of the workmen of Phularitand Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited in Barora Area No. I, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad, for category-IV wages to Shri Raghubir Lohar is justified? If so, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. The dispute has been settled out of court. A memorandum of settlement dated 7-7-1983 has been filed in Court. I have gone through the terms of settlement and I find them quite fair and reasonable. There is no reason why an award should not be made on the terms and conditions laid down in the Memorandum of Settlement. I accept it and make an award accordingly. The Memorandum of Settlement shall form part of the award.

3. Let a copy of this award be sent to the Ministry as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer
Part of the Award

MEMORANDUM OF SETTLEMENT ARRIVED BETWEEN THE MANAGEMENT OF BHARAT COKING COAL LTD., PHULARITAND COLLIERY, BARODA AREA AND RASHTRIYA COLLIERY MAZDOOR SANGH, PHULARITAND BRANCH ON 20-10-1982

Management Representative :

1. Shri S. C. Gaur, P.M. Barora Area.
2. Shri B. N. Ishwar, Agent, Phularitand colliery.
3. Shri P. P. Yadav, Sr. P.O. Phularitand colliery.

Union Representative :

1. Sri Basdeo Sarkar, Secretary, RCMS.
2. Shri Raghubir Lohar.

SHORT RECITAL OF THE CASE

The Rastriya colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Rajendra Parch, Dhanbad vide their letter No. VI(30)/82/3427-28 dt. 21-4-82 had raised an Industrial Dispute against the Management of Phularitand colliery of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. Kharkharae, Dist. Dhanbad that Sri Raghubir Lohar who was working as Tub Repairer Mistry is getting cat-III wages since 1-5-72. The matter was discussed between the parties in the conciliation, and finally filed as both the parties were adamant on their stand. At last the Personnel Manager of the Area intervened and for better Industrial Relation after a long discussion the parties agreed to settle the dispute under the following terms and conditions :—

TERMS OF SETTLEMENT

1. The Management agree to pay cat-IV wages to Sri Raghubir Lohar with immediate effect.
2. The Party will have not any claim prior to the date of settlement.
3. The dispute is finally dissolved
4. Copy of settlement will be sent to the authority concerned under Rule 58(4) of the Industrial dispute (C).

PARTIES

Sd./-
(SC Gaur),
PERSONNEL MANAGER.

Sd./-
(BN ISHWAR)
Agent.
Phularitand colliery.

Sd./-
(P. P. Yadav)
Sr. P. O. of Phularitand Colliery.

Sd./-
(Basudev Sarkar)
Secy.
Rastriya Colliery Maz.
Sangh.
Br. Phularitand.

Sd./-
(Raghubir Lohar).

[No. L-20012(232)/82-D.III(A)]

S.O. 3094.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Messrs Cemindia, Company Limited, Contractor, Camp. South Balihari, Post Office Bhagaband, District Dhanbad and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 13th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL

TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 24 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the management of Messrs Cemindia Company Ltd., contractor, Camp, South Balihari, P.O. Bhagaband, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. M. Mukherjee, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal

Dhanbad, 8th July, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S.10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government, by its order No. L-20012(443)/81-D. III(A) dated 27th February, 1982, has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms:

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Cemindia Company Ltd., at and P.O. Bhelatand (Dhanbad) in issuing notice on 14th December, 1981, for retrenching their workmen listed in the annexure below from 26-12-1981; in not regularising them in company's service, and in not transferring them to South Balihari and Bhagora sites, is justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen concerned entitled?"

ANNEXURE

NAME OF WORKMEN

1. Sri Mehabood Ahamad
2. Sri Soharai Prasad
3. Sri Chatru Rajak
4. Sri Amit Ram
5. Sri Md. Salaududdin
6. Sri Biharuddin
7. Sri Sukhdeo Bhagat
8. Sri Shyamal Kumar
9. Sri Bhim Ch. Sen
10. Sri Parambans Singh
11. Sri A. Bhattacharjee
12. Sri Banwari Ram
13. Sri Nisar Khan
14. Sri Md. Yasin
15. Sri Md. Jawed Ansari
16. Sri K. C. Khawas
17. Sri Punit Lal
18. Sri S. R. Huda
19. Sri P. Kumar
20. Sri Radha Nath Kairi
21. Sri Sohan Singh
22. Sri D. K. Biswas
23. Sri Md. Murthuza
24. Sri Jogindar Singh
25. Sri Md. Kasim Ansari
26. Sri J. N. Ghose
27. Sri Sukh Karmarkar
28. Sri K. P. Kar
29. Sri M. L. Biswakarma
30. Sri Kmin Ansari
31. Sri N. Pramanik
32. Sri Md. Ali Hussain
33. Sri Sam Suddin Khan
34. Sri Md. Gany
35. Sri H. D. Modak
36. Sri S. Murmur
37. Sri Md. Hanif
38. Sri Bharat Bawari
39. Sri P. B. Manju
40. Sri Kanhari Rajak
41. Sri Tejenul Shah
42. Sri Jai Nath Aajwar

43. Sri Singhasesan Yadav
44. Sri Ramayan Yadav
45. Sri Ehamul Haque
46. Sri Mumtaz Ahamad
47. Sri Chandrika Mistry
48. Sri Kanta Singh
49. Sri Zamal Uddin
50. Sri Deo Narayan Ch.
51. Sri Md. Idrish
52. Sri Jaliuddin
53. Sri Taj Mahamad
54. Sri Mirajuddin
55. Sri Sansad Khan
56. Sri Wasim Ansari
57. Sri S. C. Khawas
58. Sri Ab. Karim
59. Sri H. L. Kumbhakar
60. Sri Ashutosh Mahato
61. Sri Sivju Mahato
62. Sri Rana Pratap Ram
63. Sri G. C. Mukherjee
64. Shri Kedar Singh
65. Sri S. K. Chakraborty
66. Sri B. R. Chakraborty
67. Sri Sagir Khan
68. Sri N. C. Chatterjee

2. From the annexure attached to the schedule of this reference it will appear that they are 68 workmen. Their case is that they have been working as employees of Messrs Cemindia Company Ltd. previously known as Messrs Cementation Co. According to the workmen they have been working in permanent and perenial nature of jobs. According to them all of them put in more than 240 days attendance in each calender year. The company takes contract and work order of Shaft sinking in different mines coal mines and other mines. The practice followed by this company is that as soon as the contract work in a pratical mine is completed the employees of the company are served with a notice of retrenchment and called again when another work is obtained. This is said to be an unfair labour practice with the result that the workmen are deprived of their permanency and other benefits inspite of the fact that these workmen can be usefully and gainfully employed for an 'indefinite period. The workmen can also be transferred from one place to another where the work is in progress. But this is not done. The company had obtained contract in Sijua, Bhelatand of Messrs TISCO. On completion of work the management issued retrenchment notices on 14-12-81 proposing to retrench the concerned workmen w.e.f. 26-12-81. These workmen raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant-Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad and the conciliation proceeding was started. Inspite of the conciliation proceeding the company retrenched these workmen with the result that an application under S. 33 of the I.D. Act, 1947 was filed before the Conciliation Officer (C) challenging the proposed retrenchment of the workmen on the ground that the management had no darth of work because another contract work of the management was doing on at Bhelatand site, Putkee Bahihari Integrated Project and other sites. The workmen drew the attention of the conciliation officer to the fact that the officers of the company were doing contract jobs in Bhalgora and also in Putkee and Bahihari Integrated Project in the names of their wives, sons, sisters, etc. and were not prepared to accommodate these concerned workmen in the jobs which were going on. It was also urged that the management changed their service conditions by retrenching them during the pendency of the conciliation proceeding without taking prior permission of the conciliation officer. The workmen also prayed before the conciliation officer to make an enquiry into the allegations by visiting the spot. The learned conciliation officer at the request of the workers visited the above sites and found that the company had engaged contract workers in the permanent nature of jobs below the rates of minimum wages. The concerned workmen prayed before the conciliation officer to direct the management to remove the illegal and motivated retrenchment order and to transfer the concerned workmen in the above mentioned

sites for their continuous employment. But inspite of the show cause notice from the conciliation officer dated 18-12-81 the management retrenched all the concerned workmen from 26-12-81. The learned conciliation officer after hearing both the parties was pleased to pass an order on 23-12-81 clearing the retrenchment order illegal and invalid. The management being annoyed with the concerned workmen, retreched them from service and stopped payment of wages. Faced with such a situation some of the workmen were forced to accept retrenchment compensation to save their families from starvation. The workmen also alleged that most of the concerned workmen were transferred to different sites after receiving compensation. The Conciliation Officer being dissatisfied with the conduct of the management referred the matter to the Government of India and accordingly this reference has been made for adjudication on the question raised in the schedule of the reference.

3. The management of Cemindia Ltd., Calcutta has admitted that in March, 1980 the company obtained from M/s. TISCO a contract for construction, raising of Staple Shafts etc. at Bhelatand colliery. The workmen concerned were engaged in the above construction work. The construction work at Bhelatand colliery were nearing its completion when this dispute was raised by the concerned workmen. The company submitted its comments to the workmen representation dated 16-10-81 by their own letter dated 9-11-81. The case of the company is that most of the retrenched workmen, barring a few whose names appear in the annexure to the schedule of the reference, approached the management and settle their differences amicably and accepted the payment of all their dues in full and final settlement of the claims. The company's case is that notices of retrenchment were issued only when the work at Bhelatand was about to be completed and according to Section 25FFA and 25FFF of the I.D. Act, 1947 the employer had ample right to close down an undertaking set up for construction work and to retrench the workers engaged therein after following the provisions of S. 25F of the I.D. Act, 1947. The company followed the procedure as envisaged in S. 25F of the I.D. Act and therefore the action of the management in retrenching the concerned workmen cannot be said to be illegal and unjustified. With regard to the order of the Conciliation Officer on a petition under S.33 of the I.D. Act, 1947, the company's stand is that the Conciliation Officer has misdirected himself in assuming the jurisdiction and power in the matter of directing the company not to retrench these workmen.

4. It will appear from the documents and evidence of witnesses that the facts are more or less admitted. The contract for shaft sinking was entered into between the Cemindia as shown by document, Ext. M-25 dated 12-12-79. MW.1 Shri B. Raghavan is the manager of the company. Adm.inistration & Supply. He has spoken about the contract between Cemindia and TISCO for construction of staple Shaft at Bhelatand colliery. The final agreement was entered sometime in March, 1980. He has said that the contract was for construction of two shafts and such a nature of contract was not permanent. He has admitted that the concerned workmen had been working with the Cemindia from before and were recruited afresh from March, 1980 for working in this construction project. He has said that the construction work was completed in September, 1981. In December, 1981 the company retrenched all the workmen because their services were no longer required. For this notices were issued on 14-12-81. One of them is marked Ext. M7. The statutory notice is Ext. M8. His evidence is that sometime after the completion of the job at Bhelatand the company obtained some jobs at South Bahihari and Bhalgora belonging to M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. Thereafter the company recruited these concerned workmen by stages to work in the construction project. His evidence is that the construction work is still going on and the concerned workmen are still working. According to him all the concerned workmen were paid retrenchment compensation and their dues in terms of the notice dated 14-12-81. He has proved Exts. M1, M2, M3, M4, M5 and M6 as part of the correspondence between the management and the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad. He has said that in Ext. M2, Sl. No. 5 Shri Ratan Bhattacharjee is mentioned, but he was never employed in Bhelatand construction project. He is also not a workman in the schedule of the reference. The witness has deposed that whenever the company gets any contract work, the company

has to set up an undertaking and make recruitment of labour, and on completion of the work the company closes the undertaking and retrenches the workmen. This company is operating in India since 1955 in the name of Cementation Company of India. For the first time a contract under IISCO was obtained in 1964 which was completed in 1970. Thereafter in 1972 one job was secured in IISCO which was completed in 1976. According to this witness there was no job for the company from 1976 to 1980. He has denied that the nature of job of the company is perennial. According to the witness there is no scope for regularisation of the workmen in the company. He has also said that since a construction work has to be set up in different places, when required, and function independently because of the nature of work being different, there could be no transfer from one set up to another set up. He also denied that retrenchment order was passed to victimise them. The witness in cross-examination has admitted that before completion of work at Bhelatand, the company obtained work at Bhalgora and Putkee Balihari and at those sites some preliminary arrangement had been made for construction work there. He denied that construction work in Bhalgora Putkee and Balihari had all commenced in 1980. He also admitted that one Salauddin chageman was working at Bhelatand and he was deputed to work in South Balihari colliery to do some work.

5. On behalf of the workmen, Shri Sukdeo Bhagat, WW.1 was examined. He has been working in Cemindia since 1971 as record clerk and at present he is General Assistant in South Balihari colliery site. He has said that before completion of work at Bhelatand colliery, the company started work at Bhalgora and South Balihari Project. He has proved Ext. W.1, under which one Hoda was granted overtime. He also proved one attendance schedule, Ext. W.2, and Ext. W.3. His evidence is that Shri A. Bhattacharjee was appointed at Bhelatand and subsequently transferred to South Balihari project under the transfer order, Ext. W.4. Ext. W.5 has been proved by the witness to show that Shri A. Bhattacharjee and Md. Jaber worked at Balihari site on 25-6-80. There is Ext. W.6 showing the attendance of Shri Banowari Lal and Shri Punit Lal. The witness known Shri K. C. Khawas who was originally appointed at Begunia site and was transferred to Bhelatand colliery. In this connection he has proved Ext. W.7. The witness has said that Shri M. Parmanik was appointed in Bhelatand colliery and before the completion of work at Bhelatand he was transferred to South Balihari and about Salauddin also the witness has said that he was appointed in Balihari site and later on transferred to Bhelatand site. Similarly, Samsuddin Khan appointed in Bhelatand colliery was transferred to South Balihari. Shri Ram Prasad Viswakarma was appointed in South Balihari but he was transferred to Bhelatand. Similarly, Shri P. K. Sarkar was appointed in South Balihari was transferred to Bhelatand. The witness has said that Biharuddin, K. C. Khaos, S. C. Khaos, H. L. Kumbakar and Md. Sirajuddin were appointed at Begunia site and later on transferred to Bhelatand site and thereafter transferred to Bhalgora site. The witness has said that before completion of work at Bhelatand the company had started construction work at South Balihari and Bhalgora sites. He also said that after accepting the retrenchment compensation they were allowed to work at Balihari Project. According to the witness after fresh appointment the company does not give any yearly increment and in some cases appoint at lower pay. Furthermore the retrenched workmen were never appointed on any higher category. According to the witness Shri A. Bhattacharjee and Banowari Ram were made permanent after the dispute was raised. He has also said that recently one Shri M. P. Krishnan, who is not a workman here, was also made permanent. The witness has said that among the concerned workmen there are such who were appointed as far back as in 1964 and not been made permanent. The witness has said that on account of retrenchment the workers do not get continuity of service and so they are not entitled to wages for discontinued period or any gratuity.

6. WW.2 Shri Sohrai Prasad is a chargehand and his evidence is that he was appointed for the first time in Cemindia in 1964 and still continuing. He had work in

Jitpur, Bhelatand and at present he is working in South Balihari. At Jitpur he was a charge-hand with basic salary of Rs. 425. He was appointed afresh at Bheiat and as Sinker on a basic salary of Rs. 8 per day. After 9 months he was again made charge hand with a basic salary of Rs. 305. The witness has said that he never received yearly increment nor appointed in higher grade. His evidence is that A.C. Khawas, K.C. Khawas, Biharuddin, Salauddin, Hira Thakur were appointed in Basdeopur by the company and they were transferred to Begunia site of the company and then again to Bhelatand site. He has said that one of the concerned workman Banwari Ram has been regularised as charge hand and Shri A. Bhattacharjee, Electrical charge hand has also been regularised. The witness has said that at the time of the retrenchment at Bhelatand it was disclosed to the retrenched workmen that if they did not accept retrenchment compensation, they would not be appointed afresh to another site.

7. Before I go to discuss the evidence on merits of the case I would like to discuss of a technical objection taken at the time of giving on behalf of the management that this reference for adjudication has not been properly made. The contention is that a dispute of this nature is not by any union nor under S.2A of the I.D. Act, 1947. It will appear that faced with the situation of retrenchment these concerned workmen who are 68 in numbers jointly filed a representation before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad. It is this representation which turned into a dispute when in spite of the direction of the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) these workmen were retrenched. It will mean that the entire body of workmen facing retrenchment raised this dispute with a community of interest. This is a basic position which cannot be ignored. Then again it is urged that before this Tribunal there has been no proper representation and no proper authority has been given to Shri D. Mukherjee to represent the workmen. The contention of the workmen is that almost all the workmen have been attending this court on various dates and Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate of course pleaded their case. There is no doubt some technical lacuna. Shri D. Mukherjee has however argued that a similar thing can be said about the management. MW-1 Shri Raghavan in his evidence has admitted Cemindia is controlled by a Board of Directors and the Board of Directors gave him authority to sign the written statement on behalf of the company. Shri Raghavan has also said that he has not brought the authority to be produced in the court. Thereafter such an authority has not been filed. Shri D. Mukherjee has, therefore, argued that the written statement of the management should be outright rejected and the case of the workmen should be decided ex parte. Faced with such a situation the question of maintainability of this reference has not been seriously pleaded before me on behalf of the management and similarly Shri D. Mukherjee agreed that the case should be considered on merits. In view of the submissions made before me by the parties I have to hold that this reference is maintainable.

8. In considering the merits I would point out that I have placed the evidence in this case on behalf of both the parties, and the facts are no longer in dispute. Cemindia are no doubt contractors and their main contract is of shaft sinking in coal and other mines. They do specialised work on contract basis. They have their head office at Calcutta and whatever Project they take for execution they have to keep their staff at the Project site. Shri Raghavan has admitted that these concerned workmen are technical people and experienced in their jobs and some of them are in the employment of Cemindia for a pretty long time. So this case of the workmen is admitted by the management. The workmen have alleged, and this is the positive case of the management that they recruit afresh their workmen as and when the new contract is obtained, and whenever the contract is finished the workmen are retrenched. For this purpose reliance has been placed on the provisions of S. 25FFA and S.25FFF of the I.D. Act, 1947. There is no dispute with regard to the principles nobody can question the authority of the management to retrench a workman if no work can be provided to these workmen. The principle of retrenchment is an integral part of industrial law and the basic factor in the principle the retrenchment is that if the employer cannot provide any work to its workmen, he has to follow the provisions of retrenchment as provided in the Act. In this case the management's contention is that the work at Bhelatand had ended or was about to end and so the retrenchment notices were served. The workmen do not challenge the right of the management

to take resort to retrenchment as provided under the industrial law. What they contend is that if work is available with the company where they could be transferred, the company should not have retrenched them. What the workmen mean to say is that if work is available with the management no action on the part of the management to retrench the workmen could not be justified under the industrial law. I may mention that the law puts an obligation on the employer to employ retrenched workers on priority basis. In this connection it appears to be an admitted position that at Bhelatand and Putkee the workmen were subsequently employed after they accepted retrenchment compensation. The evidence on behalf of the workmen is positive on this point and also admitted by the management's witness, MW.1 Shri Raghavan. The contention on behalf of the workmen is that if they could be employed soon after retrenchment compensation was taken by them, where was the need for retrenching them at all. The contention of the workmen is that the conciliation papers will show that the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) visited the working project site of the company and was satisfied that work was going on and so issued instructions not to retrench the concerned workmen, but to transfer them to the already working sites of the company. The company however retrenched them on the ground that the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Dhanbad had no authority to pass such an order as he had no right to issue such an order under section 33 of the I.D. Act. I will not go into the question as to whether the conciliation officer had any right to issue such a direction under the provision of S. 33 of the I.D. Act. I do not find that the conciliation officer has taken resort to a follow up action after his direction had been flouted by the management. But this much is in evidence that work was available for the concerned workmen and they were simply retrenched so that their claim for regularisation and continuity of service could be broken by retrenching them.

9. The question arises as to whether the management of the company in order to break the continuity of service are entitled under industrial law to effect an order of retrenchment. On behalf of the workmen it has been said that this is an unfair labour practice. According to them each one of the workmen have put in more than 240 days attendance in a single calendar year and in this manner some of them have been working such as WW.2 since 1964. Such workmen in spite of their long years of service have not been regularised. The contention before me on behalf of the workman is that even after these workmen are regularised in service, the management should have still the power to retrench them under S.25N of the I.D. Act if no work is available. The workman in absence of continuity of service have to lose their increment, gratuity, etc. which is permissible under industrial law and if every time they have to face retrenchment their future will always remain in dark. It has also been urged on behalf of the workmen that the company should not be permitted to resort to retrenchment in spite of the fact that work is available. It has also been contended that faced with this situation the management has started pick and choose method so that during the pendency of this reference two of the concerned workmen have been regularised in service. It cannot be therefore said that the management on principle could not regularise these concerned workmen. I have to agree that the grounds advanced on behalf of the workmen against retrenchment and regularisation of these concerned workmen are sound and cannot be ignored.

10. In the last resort it has been urged on behalf of the management that these concerned workmen had been employed for a particular project and with the ending of the project they have no right to continue in the job. Shri Raghavan deposed in his evidence about the existence of separate establishment for each project. It has not been substantiated by any document filed on behalf of the company. In fact the contract was entered into between Cemindia, Calcutta and TISCO. The appointment letters were issued by Cemindia to these workmen. So there is no evidence of existence of separate establishment apart from the establishment of Cemindia. It cannot be therefore said that the establishment which appointed these workmen ceased to exist after the contract was completed. The simple position is that these workmen have been workmen of Cemindia and the retrenchment order was passed by Cemindia in spite of the fact that retrenchment was not necessary in view of the fact that construction work was going on at two sites where these workmen could be easily employed and in fact have been employed soon after these concerned workmen accepted

retrenchment compensation. It is regrettable that the conciliation officer's direction not to retrench these concerned workmen was not complied under the technical plea that the conciliation officer had no right to issue such a direction. I have to repeat that the circumstances justify the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) to issue such a direction and the same should have been followed by the company because it did not affect the right of the company in the matter of retrenchment under proper circumstances.

11. The result of the above discussion is that retrenchment of these concerned workmen was unjustified and instead they should have been transferred to the places in continuity of their services where they have been subsequently placed. The evidence in this case is that there have been a number of transfers made by this company from one site to another without affecting retrenchment and there appears to be no reason why these concerned workmen should have been retrenched. Further, these workmen appear to have been working with the company for a pretty long time and some of them have been employees of the company since 1964. Shri Raghavan has admitted on behalf of the management that these workmen have gained experience on the jobs which they have been performing under the company and so their case cannot be thrown out on the ground of unsuitability.

12. Thus, having considered all aspects of the case, the reference is answered accordingly.

I hold that the action of the management of Cemindia Company Limited at and P. O. Bhelatand (Dhanbad) in issuing notice on 14th December, 1981, for retrenching their workmen listed in the annexure of the schedule from 26-12-1981, in not regularising them in company's service, and in not transferring them to South Balihori and Bhalgora sites, is not justified. Consequently, the concerned workmen are therefore entitled to be regularised in company's service from the date of retrenchment i.e. 26-12-1981 and they are entitled to all the back wages and other emoluments from 26-12-1981.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012(443)/81-D. III(A)]

S.O. 3095.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Burragarh Colliery of Kustore Area of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 16th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL No. 1, DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Reference No. 9 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Burragarh Colliery of Kustore Area of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen.

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Manoranjan Prasad (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers.—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri S. P. Singh, General Secretary Khan Mazdoor Congress.

STATE : Bihar.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, the 8th July, 1983

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012(319)/81-D, III(A) dated, the 21st January, 1982, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Burragarh Colliery of Kustore Area of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad in refusing employment to Shri Bandhan Barhi, Pick Miner, with effect from the 11th July, 1979 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. The concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi, who has examined himself as W-1, is the son of Ganesh Bahui and he is resident of village Jogatil, P. O. Sharmatand, P. S. Jaimagar, Dist. Hazaribagh. His case has been sponsored by the Kisan Mazdoor Congress of which Sri S. K. Singh happens to be the General Secretary, who has also filed the written statement on behalf of the concerned workman. The case of the concerned workman is that he was appointed as miner/loader in Burragarh colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited on 17-10-1971 on permanent basis against permanent vacancy with identity card No. 71636, Form 'B' No. B/1569 and C.M.P. F. No. D/541564. In the year 1975 he went home on earned leave but due to the death of his mother and on account of his own illness he came back a bit late and reported for duty and in good faith he handed over his identity card, fitness certificate, leave papers etc. to the Colliery Personnel Officer and requested him to allow him to join duty. The local management assured him that after getting permission from the Area Office he will be allowed to resume his duty shortly, but actually the local management was trying to keep him in the dark. After sometime he came to know from his co-workers that a man by name Shayamlal Chamar had already been inducted in his place. After knowing this fact of impersonation with alliance between the local management and some influential person, he represented his case to the Managing Director and D.I.G. who is Chief of Security and Vigilance of the B.C.C.L. against this injustice. Meanwhile, the management of Burragarh colliery transferring the so-called Bandhan Barhi, who was actually Shayamlal Chamar, to Horiladih colliery and again from Horiladih colliery to a colliery in Area No. VII and these transfers were made only in an attempt to suppress the truth. The sponsoring union also took up this matter with the D.I.G. and Chief of Security, B.C.C.L., with a copy to the Managing Director through representations dated 5-6-80 and 15-7-80. The D.I.G. and Chief of Security, B.C.C.L. took up the matter and made comprehensive enquiry and submitted his report to the General Manager, Mr. P. N. Roy of Area No. VII in his letter No. (A-VII)80/464-65 dated 30-8-1980 with a copy to the sponsoring union in which the D.I.G. and Chief of Security, B.C.C.L., supported the case of the concerned workman in clear words and requested the management to finalise his case who was jobless. After receipt of the enquiry report of the D.I.G. and Chief of Security, the sponsoring union approached the management and later on the Mines Ministry, and, when all attempts failed, the sponsoring union approached the Labour Ministry who advised to raise an industrial dispute in the matter. As per Ministry's advice, the sponsoring union raised industrial dispute by letter dated 15-6-1981 in which the management fully participated and submitted its written comment and rejoinder, but, due to its adamant attitude, the conciliation ended in failure leading to this reference. According to the case of the concerned workman, he is victim of unholy alliance of the local management and the refusal of his employment was illegal, arbitrary and motivated. His further case is that 'over stay' is misconduct under the provision of the Standing Orders of the company and hence the management cannot terminate the service of a permanent workman without observing the formalities required under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 and no permanent workman can lose his lien on his service until and unless he is proved guilty of the misconduct and since this was not done in his case he is very much in the

employment of the management and employer-employee relationship exist between them. His prayer, therefore, is that the reference be answered in his favour and he be ordered to be reinstated on his original job with full back wages or idle period.

3. The case of the management, on the other hand, is that at the time of take over of the management of the Burragarh colliery on 17-10-71 by the B.C.C.L. a workman named Bandhan Barhi was found working in the colliery as piece-rated miner who was not on the permanent roll of the colliery and was not a regular worker and he had been shown to have been employed on 17-10-1971. The management of the B.C.C.L. allowed him to continue in the employment and he was issued an identity card after his declarations regarding his address were entered in the identity card register and other records of the management. The said workman was transferred to Horiladih colliery sometime in the year 1975 and he continued to work there on his transferred job. The concerned workman had not produced his identity card to prove that he ever worked under the present management and the identity card register also does not indicate his employment. The management was informed for the first time by the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad in his letter dated 26/27-6-1981 that the sponsoring union had raised a dispute demanding job for the concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi, on the assertion that some other person entered in his place into the employment of the colliery, and a copy of the complaint petition of the sponsoring union was enclosed along with the said letter. According to the allegations made in the complaint petition, the concerned workman went on leave and he did not turn up after the expiry of leave for a considerable period and during his absence the present incumbent impersonating himself as Bandhan Barhi entered into service and worked during the period of the unauthorised absence of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi. In this connection, the case of the management is that that another person might have been in collusion with the concerned workman and worked in his place to maintain the continuity of service of the concerned workman and in such a situation both of them are liable for disciplinary action. The concerned workman has lost his lien on his service automatically as he went on leave and did not turn up for his job for a considerable period even after the expiry of his leave. So far as the present management is concerned, the concerned workman was never in the employment of the colliery under it and no employer-employee relationship existed between the management and the concerned workman. The concerned workman never appeared before the management at any time and never asked for his job and hence there was no occasion for the management to refuse him job with effect from 11-7-79 or on any date. The contention of the management, therefore, is that the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

3. Three witnesses have been examined on behalf of the management and two witnesses have been examined on behalf of the concerned workman including the concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi. Besides, certain documents have been exhibited on either side.

4. Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) is a supervisor in Burragarh colliery. He has deposed that in the said colliery identity cards are issued to all the workmen working there. He has proved an entry No. 71636 at page 221 of the identity card register for the year 1973 in respect of Bandhan Barhi to be in the pen of Sri S. K. Mukherjee, a clerk in the office of the Personnel Officer of Burragarh Colliery, whose handwriting he knows, but who is now no longer in the employment of the colliery, and the said entry has been marked as Ext. M-1. According to him the said entry No. 71636 represents the identity card number of Bandhan Barhi and in the last column of the said entry there are also affixed his thumb impression and photograph and the said photograph is attested by Sri N. K. Sinha who was at that time Welfare Officer and who has since been promoted as Senior Personnel Officer. A look at the said entry Ext. M-1 would show that it relates to Bandhan Barhi Pick Miner, having his identity card No. 71636, and father's name as Ganesh, having his serial number in Form 'B' Register as 1469 and having his permanent address as originally written as village Jogatil, P. O. Sharmatand, Dist. Hazaribagh, Bihar which is

the admitted father's name and home address of the concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi, but which has been subsequently penned through and entirely different address has been written therein as Village Amadpur, P. O. Dhanapur, Dist. Varanasi, U. P. while retaining the other entries regarding the workman's identity card number, name, father's name and serial number in Form 'B' Register. This subsequent correction of the address of Bandhan Barhi in Ext. M-1 has been the bone of contention between the parties according to the concerned workman, the said correction in the address, which had been correctly recorded in the beginning with reference to his home address within Hazaribagh district in Bihar, was subsequently made with the connivance of local officials during his absence on leave and overstay to induct an imposter named Shyamlal Chamar whose address was subsequently written with reference to his home address within Varanasi district in U.P. after penning through the original Hazaribagh address and the said Shyamlal Chamar was inducted to work as Bandhan Barhi having his same father's name as Ganesh and same identity card number as 71636 and same serial number in Form 'B' Register as 1469. But the management has attempted to explain the said subsequent correction in the address of Bandhan Barhi through the above named witness Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) who has further deposed that at the time of issue of identity cards in the year 1973 also he was working as supervisor and he had assisted Sri N. K. Sinha in the issue of identity card and he had also made certain entries in the identity card register in as much as entries in cols. 12 and 13 of the said entry Ext. M-1 relating to Railway Station and date of issue of identity card to Bandhan Barhi had been made by him. It is further his evidence that particulars of the entries made in the identity card register were read over and explained to the workmen concerned before they put their thumb impressions and in case of any error in the entries pointed out by the workmen, the same was corrected, after taking permission of Sri N. K. Sinha, and in the case of Bandhan Barhi also having his identity card No. 71636 there was a mistake in writing his address in Col. 11 which was penned through and corrected by him. He has explained that in the address column an incorrect address of Bandhan Barhi seems to have been initially made as that was the address of Gulo Kumar and Jagdish Kumar which immediately preceded the entry relating to Bandhan Barhi and the same was subsequently corrected by him, and after taking the thumb impression of Bandhan Barhi in the last column of entry Ext. M-1 he had given him the identity card No. 71636. But this does not explain how there could be two persons of the same name of Bandhan Barhi having the same father's name as Ganesh, one in Hazaribagh district in Bihar and the other in Varanasi district in U. P. As already stated above, in the last column of Ext. M-1 relating to identity card No. 71636 there is a photograph affixed which is admittedly not the photograph of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi and in respect of the same the suggestion made to Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) in his cross-examination on behalf of the concerned workman is that the original photograph which was pasted there had been removed and another photograph had been pasted in its place, which suggestion has, however, been denied by him.

5. The aforesaid explanation given by Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) for making correction in the address of Bandhan Barhi does not appeal to reason. Firstly, Sri S. K. Mukherjee who had made the original entry, Ext. M-1, including the Hazaribagh address of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi or Shri N. K. Sinha, the then Welfare Officer, who is said to have attested the photograph, has not been examined in this case by the management and Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) has not also been able to say in his cross-examination as to on what basis Sri S. K. Mukherjee had initially written the address of different workers in column 11 of the identity card register which Bijoy Bahadur Singh (MW-1) subsequently claims to have corrected in respect of Bandhan Barhi by changing his Hazaribagh address in Bihar to Varanasi address in U. P. while retaining other particulars including the father's name as Ganesh. In Col. 6 of the entry (Ext. M-1) is noted the serial number in Form 'B' register of Bandhan Barhi as 1469. This Form 'B' register is a statutory register of employees maintained in Form 'B' of the Mines Rules 1955 as required by sub-section (1) of section 49 of the Mines Act, 1952, in which the name of each employee with

his father's name, age and home address are entered. Since serial number of Bandhan Barhi in Form 'B' register is noted in Ext. M-1 as 1469 the said Form 'B' Register must have been before Sri S. K. Mukherjee while he originally noted the address of Bandhan Barhi in Col. 11 of Ext. M-1 and from that it can reasonably be inferred that Hazaribagh address of Bandhan Barhi had been copied by Sri S. K. Mukherjee in Ext. M-1 from the address of Bandhan Barhi given at serial No. 1469 of Form 'B' register. For the reasons best known to the management, the said Form 'B' Register, which is a statutory register maintained by the management and which is the earliest register in its possession containing the address of Bandhan Barhi, has not been produced by the management, and from that an adverse inference must be drawn against the management and it must be held that the management has withheld it as it would have gone against its case had it produced it.

6. Another witness examined on behalf of the management is Girdhari Prasad (MW-2) who was formerly working as a miner in Burragarh colliery since 1967 and then he became a munshi and he is at present working as bill clerk since 1974. He has deposed that while working as a munshi he used to note down the names of the miners who used to load the tubs and amount of coal loaded by them and when he was working as a munshi the person whose photograph is affixed against the name of Bandhan Barhi in Ext. M-1 was not working in his section, but since he became bill clerk he had been making payments to that very person as Bandhan Barhi whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1, and that he had not made any payment to any other miner named Bandhan Barhi. In his cross-examination, however, he has stated that although he was working as bill clerk since 1972-73 his designation was changed as bill clerk on 30-11-74 and the ordinary duty of a bill clerk is to prepare bills regarding salary etc. and in Burragarh colliery payments are made to the workmen from 5 to 6 counters and he sits on one of those counters, and different counters are not allotted to workmen of different departments and every month it is changed. The original duty of a bill clerk being only to prepare bills regarding salaries etc. Girdhari Prasad (MW-2), who is a bill clerk since 1974, is not competent to say as to who has been made payments of salary as Bandhan Barhi. Moreover it is the case of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi that in the year 1975 he went home on earned leave but due to death of his mother and his own illness he came back a bit late and reported for duty but he was not allowed to do so and he learnt from his co-workers that a man by name Shyamlal Chamar had already been inducted in his place. Therefore, it is also not surprising if another person whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 and which is not the photograph of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi is being paid salary in the name of Bandhan Barhi from 1975 onwards. Girdhari Prasad (MW-2) has also proved an order of transfer dated 22-10-1975 (Ext. M-2) of several workmen including Bandhan Barhi from Burragarh colliery to Hurrulidih Project by Sri R. Jha, the then Manager of Burragarh colliery. But the said order of transfer is of no assistance in this case as the parentage or the address of Bandhan Barhi is not noted in the said order of transfer.

7. The third witness examined on behalf of the management is Sri D. Singh (FW-3) who is Asstt. Manager of Burragarh Colliery since 1973 whose work is to inspect and check the work of miners working underground. He has deposed that in the said colliery that very Bandhan Barhi has all along been working whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 and no other Bandhan Barhi had worked in the said colliery. In his cross-examination he has stated that he says from his memory that Bandhan Barhi whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 used to work in Burragarh colliery and that he simply remembers the face of the workman whom he had seen working in the Burragarh colliery and whose photograph is found affixed in Ext. M-1 but he does not recollect the name of the said miner. According to the case of the concerned workman also the person whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 is admittedly working in Burragarh colliery since last several years after the concerned

workman Bandhan Barhi went home in the year 1975 on earned leave but due to the death of his mother and his own illness he came back at bit late and was not allowed to join his duty as in the mean time the workman whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 had been inducted in his place and, therefore, there is nothing surprising if Sri D. Singh (MW-3) has been seeing the workman whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 working in Burragarh colliery whom he knows simply by face but does not recollect his name. Moreover, from his evidence in cross-examination it appears that there are two pits in Burragarh colliery which are called Pits Nos. 3 and 2 and he is Asstt. Manager of Pit No. 3 and it is only occasionally that he is deputed for some urgent work to Pit No. 2 and it is the evidence of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi in his cross-examination that he used to work in Burragarh colliery in Pit No. 2 of which Satya Sahab was the Asstt. Manager at that time. It is further the evidence of D. Singh (MW-3) in his cross-examination that there are overmen and mining sirdars in pits to supervise the work of miners and it is the work of the mining sirdars to depute the miners to work on different faces within the same section and it is the mining sirdar and overmen who give report to him regarding the working of the miners but at times he also goes and sees their work. Therefore, he, as an Asstt. Manager of Burragarh colliery, appears to be entrusted with the work of general supervision and inspection and he is not expected to know each and every miner by face or by name, specially those working in Pit No. 2 of which he is not the Asstt. Manager and where he goes only occasionally when deputed for some urgent work.

8. I shall next examine the evidence adduced on behalf of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi. The concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi (WW-1), has deposed that he was working in Burragarh colliery under a contractor Chanderdeep Babu since 1967 as a pick miner and after the nationalisation of the colliery on 17-10-71 he became an employee of the B.C.C.L. and thereafter his address and identification marks were entered in Form 'B' register and in the said register his same Hazaribagh home address was entered which he has given in his deposition and that for the purpose of his identification and preparation of his identity card his photograph was also taken and he was given his identity card with his photograph. He has further deposed that in February, 1974 he went home after taking 15 days leave and while he was at home on leave his mother expired and he also fell ill and due to the aforesaid reasons he over-stayed at home for one month and three days and thereafter he went to Burragarh colliery to join his duty with a medical certificate and his leave slip to be handed over to the Labour Officer but those papers were taken away from him by one Surjan Ram a labour leader of the colliery, who was also sitting at that time near the Labour Officer and thereupon the Labour Officer did not permit him to join his duty and both the Labour Officer and Surjan Ram chastised him and asked him to go away. It is further his evidence that after two days thereafter the Labour Officer and Surjan Ram called him to the residence of the Labour Officer, and, when he went there, they, by practising deception, took away his identity card also and asked him to go home else there would be danger to his life and thereafter he went away home and about four days thereafter he went to Katras More to Sri S. P. Singh the General Secretary of the sponsoring union, Khan Mazdoor Congress, and there he told him everything and he also made a written complaint to the Chief Security Officer, Jealgora, and, thereafter, at the instance of the Security Officer, Jealgora, there was an enquiry made at his village by the police of Jainagar P. S. within whose jurisdiction his village Jogiatil lies in Hazaribagh District. He has next deposed that he learnt that in his place another person named Ram Sevak Chamar of Varanasi had been working and the photograph in Ext. M-1 is of the said Ram Sevak Chamar who is working in his place under the guise of Bandhan Barhi who was at first transferred from Burragarh colliery to Horralidih and who has since been again transferred from Horralidih to Gopalchauh. In his cross-examination he has proved a postal acknowledgement receipt dated 31-8-77 (Ext. M-3) regarding letter which he had sent to the Security Officer, Jealgora, by Regd. Post. On re-call, he has also proved the office copy of a letter dated 10-8-77 (Ext. W-1) which he had addressed to the Chief Security Officer, BCCCL, Jealgora regarding wrong appointment of a miner in Burragarh colliery in his place. He had sent the said letter to the Chief Security

Officer by Regd. Post in respect of which the postal acknowledgement receipt is Ext. W-2.

9. Another witness examined on behalf of the concerned workman is Meghlal Kumhar (WW-2) who has deposed that he worked in Burragarh colliery from 1971 till the last part of 1975 and he was thereafter transferred to Horralidih colliery where he remained for about one and half month and then he was transferred to Sudamdih colliery from where he was again transferred to Putki colliery in the year 1976 and since then he is working there as a driller but inspite of all these transfers he has continued to live at Burragarh colliery. He has deposed that he knows the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi who had been examined as WW-1 and who was present in Court as he belongs to his village and both of them together used to work in Burragarh colliery, but he does not know the person whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1. In his cross-examination he has asserted that Bandhan Barhi (WW-1) worked in Burragarh colliery till 1973 or 1974.

10. It would, thus, be noticed that not only the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi (WW-1) has pledged his oath in Court in support of his case that he is the real Bandhan Barhi whose name appears in Ext. M-1 but he has also examined a co-worker named Meghlal Kumhar (WW-2) who worked with him in Burragarh colliery and who belongs to his village. But the management has not dared to put the person in the witness box whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 to say that he is the real Bandhan Barhi nor the management has been able to examine any co-worker of Bandhan Barhi to say that the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi is not the real Bandhan Barhi or that the real Bandhan Barhi is some one else whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1, nor the management has thought it fit to file in court the identity card of the person whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 to show what is the address mentioned therein and if there is any similar correction of address in it as is to be found in Ext. M-1 and from all these an adverse inference must be drawn against the management and it must be held that if the person whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 would have been put in the witness box and his identity card would have been filed by the management the same would have disproved the management's case.

11. It appears that the General Manager of the BCCL in his letter No. S-7/PER/77/471 dated 22-2-1977 had referred the present case to the D.I.G. and Chief of Security, BCCCL, Jealgora for enquiry. The enquiry report of Sri R. N. Singh, the then Addl. I.G. and Chief of Security is contained in his letter No. (A-VII)/80:464-65 dated 3-8/1-9-80 addressed to Sri P. N. Rai, General Manager, BCCCL, Bhagaband Area (Area VII) in which he had reported that an enquiry conducted at his level disclosed that Bandhan Barhi son of Ganesh Barhi of Village Jogiatil, Jainagar, Hazaribagh (which is admittedly the name, parentage and village address of the concerned workman Bandhan Barhi) was working in Burragarh colliery since nationalisation and after putting in two years of service he went home on leave, but, unfortunately, when he was on leave his mother died and he himself fell sick due to which he turned up for duty with abnormal delay, and, in the meantime Sri Surjan Ram, then a local leader of Rashtriya Colliery Mazdoor Sangh in Area VIII, managed to get another person inducted in place of Bandhan Barhi who is still out of job and has been running from pillar to post and the other person who has been inducted in his place is an imposter and, therefore, the claim of Bandhan Barhi son of Ganesh Barhi of Village Jogiatil, P. S. Jainagar, Dist. Hazaribagh may be entertained and finalised. A copy of the enquiry report was also forwarded to Sri S. P. Singh General Secretary of the sponsoring union and that has been marked as Ext. W-4. It appears that Sri S. P. Singh, General Secretary of the sponsoring union had also addressed a letter dated 8-12-80 in this regard to Sri Narain Dutt Tiwari, Union Labour Minister, and Ext. W-3 is the reply dated 23-5-81 of Smt. Ramdulari Sinha, Minister of State for Labour, Central Government, addressed to Sri S. P. Singh stating that the grievance of the workman reported in his letter had been investigated by the concerned officers of the Central Industrial Relation Machinery and the position reported by

them after investigation into the complaint is given in the enclosed note. The enclosed note is also to the effect that Bandhan Barhi, after proceeding on leave, remained absent from duty for a long time even after the expiry of his leave and finally when he reported back for duty, it was found that an imposter was working in his place and the management did not allow him to resume in duty, but no action could be taken by the Central Industrial Relation Machinery as no industrial dispute was raised on the demand of the workman, and, therefore, the union had been advised to raise an industrial dispute so that the Asst. Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad, could appropriately deal with the complaint.

12. From all accounts, therefore, the case of the concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi, of Hazaribagh district, appears to be true and it is held that he was working as a miner in Burragarh colliery but when he went on leave he made long delay in reporting himself for duty on account of the death of his mother and his own illness and, in the meantime, an imposter, whose photograph is affixed in Ext. M-1 and who belongs to Varanasi, was inducted in his place with the result that the concerned workman was unjustifiably not allowed to join his duty when he reported for duty without taking any recourse to any legal formalities of holding any domestic enquiry for any alleged misconduct of overstay or without fulfilling the conditions precedent to retrenchment of a workman prescribed in Section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The reference is, therefore, answered in favour of the concerned workman and it is held that the action of the management in refusing employment to the concerned workman, Bandhan Barhi, pick miner, with effect from 11-7-1979 is unjustified and the concerned workman is entitled to be reinstated with effect from the said date with all back wages. In the circumstance of the case, there will be no order as to cost.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(319)/81-D.III.A]

S.O. 3096.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Muraidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th July '83.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 3 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S.10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947.

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Muraidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, P.O. : Nawagarh, Dist. Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate

STATE : Bihar. INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 14th July, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S.10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-20012(307)/81-D.III (A) dated 20th January, 1982 has referred this matter to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Muraidih Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad in reverting Shri Gadadhar Jena from Wagon Drill Operator after utilising him as such for over six months is

justified? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?

2. The concerned workman Shri Gadadhar Jena happened to be an overburden remover in Muraidih colliery. The Agent of the colliery authorised the concerned workman to work as wagon drill operator as he had already obtained training and experience. While working as wagon drill operator he was reverted to his original job by an order dated 23-5-81 on the ground that his work was not found satisfactory. The concerned workman represented before the management and when his grievances were not redressed, he raised an industrial dispute which has been referred to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. The case of the management is that the concerned workman was allowed to work as wagon drill operator by the order dated 28-9-80 as trainee and since his work was not found to be satisfactory he was reverted by an order dated 23-5-81. The claim of the concerned workman for regularisation is said to be unjustified and this reference is also said to be not maintainable.

4. Both the parties have adduced oral evidence and some documentary evidence. MW-1 Shri R. K. P. Srivastava is Personnel Officer in Muraidih Colliery since 1979 and he knows the concerned workman. He has proved one letter, Ext. M-1 issued by the Agent of the colliery Shri B. N. Jha to the concerned workman for training as wagon drill operator. Though a letter Ext. M-2 Shri B. N. Jha discontinued his training. Thereafter the concerned workman worked as General mazdoor in category I because the work of overburden remover had been stopped in the section of the colliery. He has deposed that the concerned workman never received an authorisation for working as wagon drill operator under Section 36 of the Mines Regulation, MW-1 in his cross-examination has admitted the letter dated 26th September 1980 bearing the signature of the Agent Shri B. N. Jha. It was marked Ext. W-1. He has said Ext. M-1 is a carbon copy of Ext. W-1. The witness has also proved Ext. W-2 which is a letter dated 23-5-81 and he has also proved an office order Ext. W-3 signed under the signature of the Agent, Shri Arjun Sinha.

5. The other witness examined on behalf of the management is Shri Arjun Sinha (MW-2). He is working in Muraidih Colliery since January 1980. He knows the concerned workman. In the month of September, 1980 he directed the concerned workman to work as a trainee operator of wagon drill. He was reverted from that post w.e.f. 23-5-81 by the order of the Agent, Shri B. N. Jha (Ext. M-2). His work was found unsatisfactory and hence the office order, Ext. M-2 was issued. He has also said that the wagon drill on which the concerned workman used to work was shifted to another colliery subsequent to the removal of the concerned workman. Thereafter another drill was commissioned in the project which was of a superior type. As there was shortage of drill operator, the concerned workman was authorised to work as a trainee operator of this drill machine. He has proved a letter, Ext. W-3. In his cross-examination he has deposed that he was not aware of the reason for the Agent to come to the conclusion that the performance of the concerned workman as wagon drill operator was unsatisfactory.

6. The concerned workman as WW-1 has deposed that he is working in Muraidih colliery as RECP drill operator. He was authorised to work as wagon drill operator on 20-9-80 although he had been already working as wagon drill operator since 1980. He worked as wagon drill operator till December, 1981, and after that he has been working as RECP operator. On 23-5-81 he was issued a letter asking him not to work as wagon drill operator. He protested against that order and thereafter he was allowed to work as wagon drill operator till December, 1981. He has denied that wagon drill was shifted to any other colliery as deposed by MW-2. His evidence is that RECP drill is more sophisticated than wagon drill and more skill is required to operate RECP drill. He has said that the operators of RECP drill get excavation category D. His grievance is that he has not been put into excavation grade at all because he is getting category I wages. His evidence is that he has been working continuously as drill operator since January, 1980 and inspite of the order of reversion he continued to work as wagon drill operator and has also put in more than 240 days attendance in each calendar year. According to him he is a member of Janta Mazdoor Sangh and therefore has been victimised.

7. The present position is that the concerned workman is working as RECP drill operator as from March, 1982 as admitted by MW-2 in his cross-examination. MW-2 has also admitted that that RECP drill is more sophisticated than the ordinary drill, and for operating this drill more skill is required. MW-1 in his cross-examination has admitted that RECP drill operators get excavation grade D. It will appear that after March, 1982 upto the present day the concerned workman has been operating RECP drill and his duties have not been changed by any fresh order. Ext. M-3 is dated 19th March, 1982 is an office order under which the concerned workman, Shri Gadadhar Jena has been authorised to work as trainee operator of RECP drill with immediate effect until further order. It may be mentioned that so far as the drill operators are concerned they have to be regularised on the basis of 240 days attendance in a calendar year. No attendance register has been produced, but apparently since there has been no discontinuation of his work up till now, the concerned workman has completed the requisite 240 days to earn his regularisation as RECP drill operator in excavation grade D. But the question that has been referred to be answered in the schedule of his reference is whether the management should have reverted the concerned workman after utilising his services as wagon drill operator for over six months. It has been pointed out to me that through Ext. W-1 dated 28-9-80 the concerned workman was allowed to operate wagon drill in all the three shifts. This is the original which was given to the concerned workman. Its office copy is Ext. M-1 in which in ink has been added "he will work as trainee". This writing in ink is absent in Ext. W-1 and so this is a subsequent addition. Ext. M-2 is the reversion order dated 23-5-81 on the ground that his work was not found to be satisfactory as trainee drill operator. He was reverted w.e.f. 25-5-81. The period between Ext. M-1 and Ext. M-2 comes to 238 days and so he had not completed 240 days which is a minimum requirement for his being regularised as wagon drill operator. This appears to be the reason why in the original order Ext. W-1 it was not mentioned that he was working as trainee. The point is that he was independently asked to operate the three shifts goes to show that he has already received training earlier. The positive case of the concerned workman is that since January, 1980 he has been operating this wagon drill, but in September, 1980 he got an office order to that effect. It is likely that since January 1980 he was asked to take training as wagon drill operator and in September, 1980 he was put on the job independently. It is therefore clear that the concerned workman was reverted through Ext. M-2 not on account of the fact that he was found deficient in training but because the management did not want to regularise him as wagon drill operator and so gave the break in his service before completion of 240 days. There is no law against artificial break in service although it may be working against the interest of the workman. I have already said that there was no adverse report against the concerned workman so as to revert him on the ground of inefficiency. The fact that the concerned workman was given heavier responsibilities to operate RECP drill machine would go to show that the concerned workman carried on his duties proficiently enough to earn him the job of driving RECP drill machine. Suffice it to say that the answer to the schedule of this reference is very much restricted inasmuch as we have only to find if the reversion order is justified. Since the concerned workman has not completed 240 days from the date of his first appointment, he has not earned regularisation in the job of wagon drill operator and so it was within the discretion of the management to revert him and such reversion cannot be held to be illegal or unjustified. Yet, I must observe that the concerned workman is employed on higher skilled job since March, 1982 (Vide Ext. M-3) and it is for the management to consider whether he has already completed 240 days attendance and should be regularised without any delay.

8. Having considered all aspects of the case the reference is answered accordingly.

The action of the management of Mumbidih colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited Post Office Nawagarh, District Dhanbad in reverting Shri Gadadhar Jena from Wagon Drill Operator after utilising him as such for over six months

is justified. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012/(307)/81-D.III.A]

S.O. 3097.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kustore Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19th July, 1983.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD

Reference No. 89 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kustore colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post office : Kustore, District Dhanbad and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri B. Joshi, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri M. M. Mallik, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar

INDUSTRY : Coal.

Dhanbad, 15th July, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Government of India by its order No. L-20012(105)/82-D.III(A) dated 9th August, 1982 has referred this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Kustore colliery of Kustore Area of M/s. Bharat Coking Coal Ltd., Post office Kustore, District Dhanbad in refusing employment to Shri Jhaboo Harijan, Timber Mistry with effect from the 21st January, 1982 is justified ? If not, to what relief is the workman concerned entitled ?"

2. The concerned workman, Shri Jhaboo Harijan is a timber mistry in Kustore colliery where he has been working since 1967. His case is that he had gone to attend his duty on 19-1-1982 when S/Shri Sarju Singh, mining sirdar and Sharma overman of the colliery threatened him and stopped him his work. On 21-1-1982 the concerned workman reported the matter to the colliery manager and informed him that from 21-1-82 his attendance was not being marked. No action was taken by the colliery manager. On 23-1-82 the concerned workman filed an application before the Agent, Kustore colliery, but his grievances were not redressed. He had also requested the management several times to transfer him to any other face of the colliery but the management did not even pay any attention to the same. He then approached his union i.e. Coal Mines Timber Workers Association, Bekarband, Dhanbad and this industrial dispute was raised before the Assistant Labour Commissioner(C) Dhanbad resulting into this reference for adjudication.

3. The management's case on the other hand is that the concerned workman has wilfully absented himself because he did not like to work at the depillering district where systematic Support Rules are applicable, and he wanted his transfer to some other places where there could be light

job. The plea taken by him that he was threatened and harassed by the mining sirdar and overman was not correct. The management repeatedly asked the concerned workman to report for duty at Kustore colliery and even requested the Assistant Labour Commissioner(C) Dhanbad during conciliation to persuade the concerned workman to resume duty, but in spite of that he absented himself from duty. Later on as per his request he has been transferred to Jealgora colliery. The concerned workman, has not reported for duty there.

5. On behalf of the workman no oral evidence was adduced, but three documents were admitted into evidence on his behalf on admission by the management. Ext. W.1 is a letter of the concerned workman addressed to the Agent, Kustore colliery. It is undated but it appears to have been received by the management on 28-1-82. His grievance in this letter is that the attendance clerk stopped marking his attendance since 20-1-82 for reasons best known to him (attendance clerk). He further said that no charge-sheet has been issued against him nor he has been suspended. He has prayed for payment of wages from 20-1-82 to the date of his joining. Ext. W.2 is a letter dated 3-3-82 signed by the Dy. Personnel Manager, Kustore area addressed to the Assistant Labour Commissioner(C) Dhanbad. It is show cause of the management against the industrial dispute raised by the concerned workman. The plea taken was that from 21-1-82 the concerned workman was absent on his own accord. It was also mentioned that he was asked to join his duty through letter dated 31-1-82 within 3 days, but the concerned workman was neither available in his residence nor in the colliery. A charge sheet was however issued against him by the manager, Kustore colliery for absents without information or without sanctioned leave from 21-1-82. The charge-sheet is dated 25-2-82. The management, however, said that they have no objection to allow him to resume to duty pending enquiry into the charge-sheet issued to him. Ext. W.3 is a letter dated 25-2-82 issued by the manager, Kustore colliery to Shri Jaboo Harijan, Timber mistry, Kustore North colliery. It was alleged that he was absenting from duty from 21-1-82 without sanctioned leave or any information regarding his absence. His attention was drawn to clause 27(16) of the Standing Order under which continued absence for more than 10 days could be a ground for his dismissal. He was directed to report for duty with full documentary proof of the reason of absence within 7 days of the receipt of this letter.

5. It will appear from the documents produced on behalf of the concerned workman that there was no allegation against the mining sirdar or the overman about threatening him and stopping him from work. The only allegation is that the attendance clerk refused to mark his attendance and therefore he applied to the Agent for giving him wages for those days on which his attendance was not being marked. The management, however, has examined MW-1, Shri A. K. Sharma, Senior overman. He has said that Jaboo Mistry was working in de-pillering for about 1-1/2 years before 1982, but he did not used to perform his duties allotted to him. The concerned workman always wanted to be transferred to some other work on the development side. In the development district the work load of timber mistry is lighter than the de-pillering district. He denied that he had ever stopped him from duty from 19-1-82 or threatened to kill him if he continued to work in the mine. He has clearly said that he would not stand in the way if the concerned workman come to do his duty. Similar is the evidence of MW-2, Shri Sarju Singh. He is also a senior overman. He also denied that he threatened the concerned workman with bad consequence and stopped him from work. His evidence is that he never asked the attendance clerk not to mark his attendance. MW-3 Shri A. K. Srivastava is attendance clerk in Kustore colliery since 1971. In the year 1982 he was attendance clerk of No. 1 and 10 Pit mines. In his shift Jaboo Mistry was working as prop mistry. He has said that since 20-1-82 Jaboo Mistry stopped coming to duty. He has denied that he was asked by the manager or overman not to mark his attendance. He has no idea why Jaboo Mistry stopped coming to duty. MW-4 Shri S.M. Lochwar is Agent of Kustore colliery since 1981. The total strength of the colliery is about 2200 and the strength of timber mistry or timber mazdoor are about 200. He has

said that the concerned workman was never stopped from work, but he himself started absents. On receipt of text, W.1 he required from the Personnel Officer Shri P. K. Sinha to make an enquiry. On the information given by Shri Sinha he issued one letter asking the concerned workman to join duty Ext. W.2 refers to his earlier letter. He did not join his duty in spite of that and therefore charge-sheet, Ext. W.3 was issued. In that charge-sheet also the concerned workman was required to report for duty within 7 days. He, however, did not submit any reply to the charge-sheet. He has said that in the written statement it was clearly mentioned that the concerned workman would be taken into service if he reported for duty. In his cross-examination he has said that the Personnel Officer reported to him that the allegation as contained in Ext. W.1 was not correct. He has said that in the depillering district the job was tougher and this is why the concerned workman did not want to work there and wanted to transfer him to another district or another mine. The witness has said that if the concerned workman reported for duty he would be fully responsible for his attendance and safety. He did not see any reason why the staff under whom the concerned workman would be required to work would object to his working.

6. On 12-4-83, which was a date fixed for this reference for further hearing, when the concerned workman was present and in his presence a petition was filed by the management that the concerned workman has already joined his duty and is working. The concerned workman also personally said before this Court that he has been put on the job and he is working. The learned lawyer appearing on behalf of the concerned workman did not press for any relief in this reference in view of the fact that the concerned workman had already joined his duty and was peacefully working.

7. So far as answer to the schedule of this reference is concerned, it will appear that on behalf of the workman nothing has been proved to show that the management or any other subordinate staff of the management, stopped the concerned workman from duty. Apparently the concerned workman wilfully absented himself and possibly because he did not want to work on the depillering side and desired his transfer to development side. MW-4, the Agent of the colliery has said that the concerned workman did not even put an application to that effect nor personally approached him for a transfer. He has also said that if he had any grievance that could have been looked into by him.

8. This reference is therefore answered as below :

The Question as to whether action of the management of Kustore colliery of Kustore area of Bharat Coking Coal Limited Post office Kustore, District Dhanbad in refusing employment to Shri Jaboo Harijan, timber mistry with effect from the 21st January, 1982 does not arise. Consequently, the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

This is my award.

Sd/-

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. L-20012(105)82-D.III.A]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1983

S.O. 3098.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 1, Dhanbad in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Kujama Colliery of Messrs. Bharat Coking Coal Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th July, 1983.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL
TRIBUNAL NO. 1, DHANBAD**

In the matter of a reference under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the
I.D. Act, 1947

Reference No. 57 of 1981

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Kujama,
Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited,
Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice Manoranjan Prasad (Retd.) Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

For the Employers—Shri G. Prasad, Advocate.

For the Workmen—Shri Lalit Butnan, Vice-President,
United Coal Workers' Union, Dhanbad.

STATE : Bihar. **INDUSTRY :** Coal.

Dhanbad, dated the 14th June, 1983

AWARD

By Order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated, the 28th September, 1981, the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour has, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, referred the following dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication :

‘Whether the action of the management of Kujama Colliery of Messrs Bharat Coking Coal Limited, Post Office Jharia, District Dhanbad in dismissing Shri Suresh Rai, Munshi from service with effect from the 16th August, 1975 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?’

2. The case of the management is that on 28-11-74 at about 1 p.m. while the superintendent, Sri A. Dutta, Asst. Managers, Sri Rohtagi and Sri N. P. Bhattacharya and the office Supdt, Sri S. Bhattacharjee, all of Ganhoodih Colliery, were discussing important colliery affairs in the Manager's room, the concerned workman, Sri Suresh Rai, who had been working in Kujama Colliery as a munshi, intruded there in an unauthorised and unwarranted manner and after taking his seat on the table in their midst he abused and threatened the Asstt. Manager, N. P. Bhattacharya, and caught hold of him by his hair and threatened him with dire consequences saying that he would shoot him and his entire family. The concerned workman was thereupon issued a chargesheet dated 30-11-1974 (Ext. M-1) by the Manager, Kujama Colliery, for the aforesaid misconduct under para 27(1) and (5) of the Certified Standing Orders of the colliery setting forth the substance of the charges against him and asking him to show cause within 48 hours of the receipt of the chargesheet, and he was also suspended simultaneously pending the enquiry. He received the chargesheet and replied thereto on 9-12-1974 denying the charges. His explanation was not found satisfactory and a domestic enquiry was held on several dates in his presence after giving due notice to him in accordance with the principles of natural justice. He appeared and fully participated in the domestic enquiry and he was given full chance and opportunity to cross-examine the management's witnesses and to examine himself and his defence witnesses. Thereafter the enquiry officer submitted his report on 31-5-1975 finding the concerned workman guilty of the charges. The enquiry report was considered at various levels and he, having been found guilty of the charge, was dismissed from service by letter dated 16-8-1975 issued by the Agent after necessary approval of the competent authority was obtained. The management also submitted that the fairness and propriety of the

domestic enquiry may be decided as a preliminary issue, and, in case it be found that the domestic enquiry was not fair and proper, the management may be given an opportunity to lead oral and documentary evidence afresh before this Tribunal to justify the action taken.

3. It is further the case of the management that the present dispute had also been raised earlier but the Central Government had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication as on consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case it had come to the conclusion that the dispute was not fit for reference for adjudication because the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified, and had conveyed the same to the management and to the sponsoring union in its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.IIIA. dated 26/27th April, 1976, a copy whereof is Annexure-1 to the management's written statement. Subsequent to the refusal of the Central Government to make a reference, however, the union of the workmen made another representation to the Central Government for conciliation and consideration of the case of the concerned workman on 13-11-1979 and conciliation proceeding was commenced afresh after three years by the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), and the Conciliation Officer in his letter No. 2(8)/76-B.I./E.III dated 11-12-1970 referred the matter to the Central Government, and the Central Government, without considering that the dispute had once come to an end by its earlier aforesaid order dated 26/27-4-1976 by which it had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that it did not find the action of the management in dismissing the workman concerned on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry to be either illegal or unjustified, referred the same dispute, without hearing the employer, after a lapse of several years, by its present order dated 28-9-1981, for adjudication to this Tribunal. The case of the management in this connection is that the Central Government having once declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on a proper consideration of the facts of the case, it had no jurisdiction to refer the same dispute on the same facts, without hearing the employer, and in making the present reference the Central Government acted in a partisan manner and against the principles of natural justice, and, therefore, this Tribunal has also got no jurisdiction to entertain the reference or to make an award.

4. The case of the concerned workman, on the other hand, is that the Manager of Kujama colliery, no doubt, issued a chargesheet dated 30-11-1974 against him alleging that he had entered into the room of the Manager of Ganhoodih Colliery at about 1 p.m. of 28-11-1974 and had abused, threatened and pulled the hair of Shri N. P. Bhattacharya, Assistant Manager and had also threatened him with dire consequences; but the allegations made against him were all false and baseless and he had accordingly submitted his reply to the chargesheet denying the allegations. He further admits that the enquiry was held on 10th, 11th and 12th February, 1975, but, according to him, the domestic enquiry was neither fair nor proper and no independent witness was examined in the enquiry, and though the enquiry was completed on 12-2-1975, it was after a lapse of 6 months that the management passed the order dismissing him from his service by letter dated 16-8-1975 which was signed by the Agent, Ganhoodih colliery. According to him, the management acted with malafide intention and victimised him for his trade union activities as he was the organising secretary of the Union. It is further his case that the Manager of Kujama colliery was not the competent authority to issue the chargesheet against him for an alleged occurrence which took place in another colliery i.e. Ganhoodih colliery, and the dismissal order passed by the Agent, Ganhoodih colliery, against him was also illegal as he was an employee of Kujama colliery.

5. The positive case of the concerned workman is that he has been working in Kujama Colliery as a Munshi for long and he has been an active member of the union and at the relevant time he was its Organising Secretary functioning in the Jharia-Gulukdih Sub-Area and he was looking after the union work at Kujama Colliery and Ganhoodih Colliery under the said Sub-Area. On 28-11-1974 the management

of Ghanoodh Colliery wrongfully laid off a large number of workers of No. 2 Pit of Ganhoodh Colliery which was resented by the workers, and the concerned workman, being the Organising Secretary of the Union, went to the concerned authorities along with the affected workers to enquire as to why the unjustified lay off was imposed on the workers and he returned back after talking to the Manager and the Asstt. Manager as the Sub-Area Manager was not found in his office. But the management acted with mala fide intention in issuing the chargesheet on false allegations to victimise him for his trade union activities and particularly because he had protested against the lay off of the workers on 28-11-74.

6. It is also the case of the concerned workman that the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had, no doubt, initially decided that the dispute was not fit for adjudication but on further representation made on behalf of the workmen pointing out that the aforesaid decision of the Ministry was erroneous on various grounds, the Ministry was pleased to rescind its earlier order and decided to refer the dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal, and the contention of the management that the Government had no right to re-consider the matter and to revise its earlier decision is absolutely wrong. There was no fresh conciliation proceeding in this case but the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad, had called the parties for discussion on F.O.C. report.

7. Since the concerned workman had in his written statement challenged the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry and the management in its written statement had prayed for deciding the question of fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry as a preliminary issue, the same had been taken up as preliminary issue in which the management had examined the Enquiry Officer, Shri Parmanand Maharaj (MW-1) who was, during the relevant period, posted as Personnel Officer of Alkusa Colliery, and through him the management had also got proved and exhibited certain documents including the papers of the enquiry proceedings. The said preliminary issue regarding the fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry has been decided by the order dated 14-3-1983 in favour of the management holding that the domestic enquiry was quite fair and proper. In that order it has also been held, for the reasons given therein, that the concerned workman being an employee of Kujama colliery the Manager of Kujama Colliery was the right person to issue the chargesheet dated 30-11-1974 (Ext.M-1) against him and that the letter of his dismissal dated 16-8-1975 (Ext. M-8) issued by Sri A. C. Seth, Agent, was a competent authority.

8. Now, therefore, only two points survive for decision. The first point is whether once the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had declined to refer the present dispute for adjudication by its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III. A dated 26/27th April, 1976, a copy whereof is Annexure-I to the management's written statement, on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified, it had any jurisdiction to refer for adjudication the same dispute on the same facts after several years by its present Order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 28-9-1981, without hearing the employer, and whether the reference so made is against the principle of natural justice, and whether this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain such a reference or to make an award. The second point is as to whether the order of dismissal of the concerned workman with effect from 16-8-1975 is justified on the materials on record of the domestic enquiry.

9. I shall take up the first point first. It is the admitted case of the parties that the present dispute, which relates to about 8-1/2 years old occurrence of 28-11-1974, had also been raised earlier but the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified and had conveyed the same to the management as also to the sponsoring union by its

letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26-27th April, 1976, a copy whereof is Annexure-I to the management's written statement. It is the further case of the management that subsequent to the refusal of the Central Government to make a reference, the union of workmen, however, made another representation to the Central Government for conciliation and consideration of the case of the concerned workman on 13-11-1979 and conciliation proceeding was commenced afresh after three years by the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) and the Conciliation Officer in his letter No. 2(8)/76/B.I/E.3 dated 11-12-1979 referred the matter to the Central Government, and the Central Government, without considering that the dispute had once come to an end when by its aforesaid earlier order contained in its letter dated 26th/27th April, 1976 it had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified, referred the same dispute, without hearing the employer, after a lapse of several years, by its present order dated 28-9-1981 to this Tribunal for adjudication. The case of the management in this connection is that the Central Government having once declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on a proper consideration of the facts of the case, it had no jurisdiction to refer the same dispute on the same facts, without hearing the employer, and in making the present reference the Central Government acted in a partisan manner and against the principles of natural justice, and, therefore, this Tribunal has got no jurisdiction to entertain the reference or to make an award. The case of the concerned workman, however, is that the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had, no doubt, initially decided that the dispute was not fit for adjudication, but, on further representation made on behalf of the workmen pointing out that the aforesaid decision of the Ministry was erroneous on various grounds, the Ministry was pleased to rescind its earlier order and decided to refer the dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal, and the contention of the management that the Government had no right to reconsider the matter and to revise its earlier decision is absolutely wrong. It is also the case of the concerned workman that there was no fresh conciliation proceeding in this case but the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C), Dhanbad, had called the parties for discussion on F.O.C. report.

10. From the aforesaid narration of the respective cases of the parties on this point the undisputed facts which emerge are that the present dispute, which relates to about 8-1/2 years old occurrence of 28-11-1974, had also been raised earlier but the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified and had communicated the same to the management and to the sponsoring union in its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26/27-4-1976, a copy whereof is Annexure-I to the management's written statement. But subsequently on a further representation made to the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour, the Ministry was pleased to refer the same dispute for adjudication to this Tribunal by its present order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 27-9-1981. There is some dispute between the parties on the point whether a fresh conciliation proceeding was started or not before making the present reference, the case of the management being that on a representation dated 13-11-79 made to the Central Government by the union of workmen conciliation proceeding was commenced afresh after three years by the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) and the Conciliation Officer in his letter No. 2(8)/76/B.I/E.3 dated 11-12-1979 referred the matter to the Central Government and the Central Government, without considering that the dispute had once come to an end when by its earlier aforesaid order dated 26th/27th April, 1976 it had declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified referred the same dispute, without hearing the employer, after a lapse of several years, by

its present Order dated 28-9-1981 to this Tribunal for adjudication, whereas the case of the concerned workman being that there was no fresh conciliation proceeding, but the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (C) had called the parties for discussion on FOC report. But there is no denial anywhere in the written statement or in the rejoinder of the concerned workman of the management's allegation in its written statement that after having once declined to refer the dispute for adjudication by its Order containing in his letter No. 20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26/27-4-1976 the Central Govt. had not heard the employer before revising the said order on the subsequent representation of the union of workman or before referring the dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication by its subsequent order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A), dated 28-9-1981. Therefore, the undisputed fact which emerges is that the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had not provided an opportunity of hearing to the employer, namely, the management of Kujama colliery of M/s. B.C.C. L., either by filing written representation or by providing an opportunity of oral hearing before reconsidering and revising its earlier order contained in its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26/27-4-1976 by which it had once declined to refer the dispute for adjudication on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified or before issuing its present revised order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 28-9-1981 referring the same dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on a subsequent representation of the union of workman.

11. It is in the aforesaid context that the first point which arises for consideration is whether once the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had declined to refer the present dispute for adjudication by its order contained in its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26/27-4-1976 on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workman on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified, it had any jurisdiction to refer for adjudication the same dispute on the same facts after several years by its present order No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 28-9-81 without hearing the employer and whether the reference so made is against the principle of natural justice and whether this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain such a reference or to make an award.

12. On this point several decisions have been cited on either side and I propose to examine them in their proper sequence.

13. Sri Lalit Burman appearing for the concerned workman has referred to a Supreme Court decision in the case of M/s. Western India Match Company Limited Vs. Western India Match Company Workers' Union (1970 (II) L.J. 256) in which it has been observed as follows :

"In the light of the nature of the function of the Government and the object for which the power is conferred on it, would be difficult to hold that once the Government has refused to refer, it cannot change its mind on a reconsideration of the matter either because new facts have come to light or because it had misunderstood the existing facts or for any other relevant consideration and decide to make the reference. But where it reconsiders its earlier decision it can make the reference only if the dispute is an industrial one and either exists at that stage or is apprehended and the reference it makes must be with regard to that and no other industrial dispute."

14. The aforesaid observation of the Supreme Court in the case of M/s. Western India Match Co. Ltd. (supra) has also been quoted with approval in another Supreme Court decision in the case of Avon Services Production Agencies (P) Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal, Haryana and others (1978—53 F.I.R. 341) in which it has been further observed as follows :—

"Therefore, when the Government declines to make a reference the source of power is neither dried up

nor exhausted. It only indicates that the Government for the time being refused to exercise the power but that does not dent the power. The power to make the reference remains intact and can be exercised if the material and relevant considerations for exercise of power are available; they being the continued existence of the dispute and the wisdom of referring it, in the larger interest of industrial peace and harmony. Refusal to make the reference does not tantamount to saying that the dispute, if it at all existed, stands resolved. On the contrary, the refusal to make a reference, not compelling the parties to come to a talking table or before a quasi-judicial Tribunal, would further accentuate the feelings and a threat to direct action may become imminent and the Government may as well reconsider the decision and make the reference. It is, therefore, not possible to accept the submission that if the Government had on an earlier occasion declined to make a reference, unless it be shown that there was some fresh or additional material before the Government, the second reference would be incompetent."

15. In view of the above quoted observations of the Supreme Court, the power of the Government to make a reference on a re-consideration of the matter notwithstanding its earlier refusal to make a reference can hardly be questioned. That the Government has got that power is now well settled. But here the point for consideration is not simply whether the Government has got power to make a reference on re-consideration of the matter, notwithstanding its earlier refusal to do so, but the point is whether the Government can exercise that power on a representation by a party without giving the other party an opportunity to be heard either by filing written representation or by providing an opportunity of oral hearing. The above quoted observation of the Supreme Court in the case of Avon Services Production Agencies (P) Ltd. (supra) came up for consideration before a Full Bench of the Madras High Court in the case of G. Muthukrishnan Vs. New Horizon Sugar Mills (P) Ltd., Pondichery & others (1980—41 F.L.R. 87) and it was held by their Lordships of the Full Bench that they were unable to accept the proposition that in the above statement of law made by the Supreme Court it was the intendment of the Supreme Court that, when the Government made the second reference, after their first refusal, they need not give notice to the other party, and they could straightway act on a memorandum presented to them by one of the two parties who could request them for such an administrative action. Having regard to the weight of authority prevailing in the Madras High Court since 1970 which gained acceptance in some other Courts in our country and having regard to the observations of the Supreme Court in the case of A. K. Kraipak & others Vs. Union of India and others (AIR 1970 SC. 150), it has been held by the Full Bench of the Madras High Court, by applying well known maxims, *audi alteram partem* which springs from the principles of natural justice and dictates that no man shall be condemned to a consequence un-heard, that failure to adhere to the principle would result in a decision which is a nullity because of total absence of jurisdiction, and this cannot be confined strictly to the conduct of legal proceedings, but ought to be made applicable to a body which is invested with the authority to adjudicate upon matters involving civil consequences to individuals and hence where the appropriate Government expressed its inability to refer an industrial dispute for adjudication to the Labour Court, but on a further representation made directly to the Government by the workers' union, the Government, in exercise of its statutory power under section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, referred the matter in dispute for adjudication without any notice to the employer and without hearing them, it did not act fairly in that it did not hear the employer in question, and it, therefore, follows that the award passed by the Labour Court, pursuant to such subsequent reference, made by the Government is also a nullity and made without jurisdiction and has, therefore, to be quashed.

16. The same view has been taken by a Division Bench of the Karnataka High Court in the case of Indian Telephone Industries Ltd., Bangalore vrs. State of Karnataka and others (1978—53 FJR. 16) in which also relying on two Supreme Court decisions in the cases of A. K. Kraipak and others vrs. Union of India & others (AIR 1970 SC. 150) and Mohinder Singh Gill and another vrs. The Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi & others (AIR 1978 SC. 851), it has been held by applying the principle of audi alteram partem which is applicable also to Government and all other authorities exercising administrative power when their decisions will have "civil consequences" on a citizen or a party that since a subsequent order of reference on the representation of the employee, after its earlier refusal, will undoubtedly have "civil consequences", on the employer, the Government, before deciding to make a reference in such cases, is bound to provide an opportunity of hearing to the employer either by filing written representations or by providing an opportunity of oral hearing and if it fails to provide such an opportunity it commits a manifest illegality apparent of the fact of the record resulting in substantial failure of justice to the employer, and, therefore, such subsequent reference is liable to be interfered and quashed with a direction to the Labour Court not to adjudicate the reference made to it by the Government.

17. The Calcutta High Court in the case of American Express International Banking Corporation vrs. Union of India & others (1979—39 FLR. 122) has also, for similar reasons, held that where on the self-same facts a similar dispute on due adjudication was refused to be referred to by the appropriate authorities and they subsequently reconsidered the case and made the reference, they should have heard the employer or given the necessary opportunities to them to establish that no industrial dispute, in fact, was existing or existed, and, such opportunity not having been given, the order of reference as made was liable to be quashed.

18. The Punjab & Haryana High Court has also taken the same view in the case of M/s. Escorts Limited, Faridabad vrs. Industrial Tribunal, Haryana and others (1983 Lab. I. C. 223) in which it has been held that the rule of audi alteram partem is attracted to the exercise of power a second time under Section 10(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 whilst referring the matter for adjudication after the same had been rejected earlier, and in view of adverse and sometimes grave penal and civil consequence that may well ensue by referring a dispute which has been earlier rejected the employer would be entitled to be heard before it is re-opened and referred afresh for adjudication.

19. In view of the aforesaid authorities of the different High Courts, it must be held that when the Government once declines to refer an industrial dispute for adjudication for good reasons, it can subsequently refer the same dispute for adjudication on a representation of an employee only after giving an opportunity of hearing to the employer either by filing written representations or by providing an opportunity of oral hearing, and if it fails to provide such an opportunity, it commits a manifest illegality apparent on the face of the record resulting in substantial failure of justice to the employer and such a subsequent reference is a nullity and fit to be quashed as being in violation of the principle of audi alteram partem which springs from the principle of natural justice, and such a reference to the Tribunal to adjudicate gives no jurisdiction to the Tribunal to adjudicate or to make an award and any award made by the Tribunal on such reference would also be a nullity and made without jurisdiction.

20. In view of my aforesaid findings, the first point whether once the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour had declined to refer the present dispute for adjudication by its letter No. L-20012/14/76-D.III(A) dated 26/27th April 1976, a copy whereof is Annexure-I to the management's written statement, on the ground that the action of the management in dismissing the concerned workmen on the basis of the findings of a duly conducted domestic enquiry did not appear to be either illegal or unjustified, it

had jurisdiction to refer for adjudication the same dispute on the same facts after several years by its present Order No. L-20012/14/76-D. III. A, dated 28-9-1981, without hearing the employer, and whether this Tribunal has got jurisdiction to entertain such a reference or to make an award, must be answered in the negative on the ground of violation of the principle of audi alteram partem which springs from the principle of natural justice.

21. In view of the aforesaid findings on the first point, the second point as to whether the order of dismissal of the concerned workman with effect from 16-8-1975 is justified on the material on records of the domestic enquiry need not be decided as any such decision would be a nullity and made without jurisdiction.

MANORANJAN PRASAD, Presiding Officer.

[No. L-20012(14)/76-D. III(A)]

A. V. S. SARMA, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 21st July, 1983

S.O. 3099.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta-69, in the Industrial Dispute between the employers in relation to the management of 22 Collieries specified in the award and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 11th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL : CALCUTTA

Reference No. 15 of 1971

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of 22 Collieries specified in Schedule I of the Order of Reference.

AND

Their workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of management—Mr. S. M. Ashraf, Personnel Manager, Mr. N. R. Chatterjee, Deputy Personnel Manager, Mr. M. P. Roy, Senior Personnel Officer, Mr. Y. N. Prasad, Senior Personnel Officer.

On behalf of Workmen—Absent.

STATE : West Bengal.

INDUSTRY : Coal.

AWARD

The following dispute was sent to this Tribunal for adjudication by the Govt. of India, Ministry of Labour by their Order No. 1/20/69-LR. II dated 13th January, 1971 :

"SCHEDULE I"

Sl. No. Name of the Colliery.

1. Samla Kendra Colliery.
2. Samla Chatrishgonda Colliery.
3. Samla Ramnagar Colliery.
4. Samla Colliery.
5. Jaipuria Kajora Colliery.
6. East Kajora Colliery.
7. Agent, Jamuria Group.
8. Agent, Dishergarh Group.
9. Dalmia Colliery.
10. South Bhagran Colliery.
11. North Jambad Colliery.
12. S. K. Jambad Colliery.

13. Burra Chemo Colliery.
14. K. L. Selected Chalbapur Colliery.
15. D. Bright's Rana Colliery.
16. New Ghusick Colliery.
17. East Chora Colliery.
18. Selected Searsole Colliery.
19. Monoharbahal Colliery.
20. South Jairamdanga Colliery
21. Chora Colliery.
22. Krishnagar Colliery.

SCHEDULE II

"Whether the managements of the collieries referred to in Schedule I are justified in not introducing wage structure and other benefits in accordance with the recommendations of the Central Wage Board for the Coal Mining Industry as accepted by the Government of India, in their Resolution No. WB-16(5)/66 dated the 21st July, 1967? If not, what should be the wage structure and other benefits in respect of the workman concerned and from what date?"

2. The case is called for hearing today. Mr. S. M. Ashraff, Personnel Manager, appears for Monoharbahal Colliery. Mr. N. R. Chatterjee, Deputy Personnel Manager for ECL headquarters, Mr. M. P. Roy, Senior Personnel Officer for Chora Colliery and Mr. Y. N. Prasad, Senior Personnel Officer appears for Bonjemihari (R) Colliery. No body appears for the workmen.

3. Mr. Ashraff, Mr. Chatterjee, Mr. Roy and Mr. Prasad for the management file petitions for time to file written statements but after considering the legal position on seeing the schedule of reference they do not press for time and have pointed out that the reference has now become incompetent. I think, they are right.

4. From the order of reference it is clear that the cause of action which was in existence in the year 1971 has now disappeared after nationalisation of the Coal Industry in 1973. At present, there is therefore no industrial dispute in existence between the parties concerned. The reference has therefore become infructuous and incompetent.

I pass award accordingly.

Dated, Calcutta.

The 1st July, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. 1/20/69/L.R. II-Part]

S.O. 3100.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta-69, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, Post Office Neutoria, District Purulia (W.B.) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on The 18th July, 1983.

CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL AT CALCUTTA

Reference No. 68 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Mr. Justice M. P. Singh—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Mr. B. N. Lala, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen—Mr. S. Roy, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, by their Order No. L-19012(116)/82-D.IV(B) dated 22nd November, 1982 referred a dispute as to whether the action of the Agent, Parbelia Colliery, Post Office Neutoria, District Purulia of Messrs Eastern Coalfields Limited, in not regularising Shri T. P. Chatterjee as Telephone Operator since July, 1978 and non-payment of difference of wages is justified and if not, to what relief the workman is entitled, to this tribunal for adjudication.

2. When the case was called out for hearing today, the representatives of the parties submitted a Memorandum of Settlement and prayed for an award in terms thereof. I have gone through the settlement and I find it fair, reasonable and for the interest of both the parties. I therefore accept the same.

In the result, an Award is passed in terms of the Memorandum of Settlement which shall form part of this award as Annexure "A"

Dated, Calcutta,

The 11th July, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

ANNEXURE 'A'

BEFORE THE HON'BLE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, CALCUTTA.

In the matter of Reference No. 68 of 1982

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Parbelia Colliery of E.C. Ltd.

AND

Their workmen

Joint petition of compromise :

Both the parties herein concerned beg most respectfully to submit and state as under :

1. That the above matter is pending before the Hon'ble Tribunal and the matter has not been heard as yet.

2. That, the parties, in the meantime, discussed the instant matter mutually and has resolved the instant dispute by coming to a settlement on the following terms :—

(a) That the management agrees to pay to the concerned workman acting/officiating allowance for working as Telephone Operator in Technical Grade-D with effect from 25-7-80 for six months upto 24-1-81.

(b) That the management agrees to treat the promotion of the concerned workman to Technical Grade D effective from 25-1-81 and his seniority in the Grade will be counted as from 25-1-81.

(c) That the arrear wages if any arising out of the foregoing two terms will be calculated after adjusting any payment already made in this regard, and paid within a period of three months from the date this settlement is accepted by the Hon'ble Tribunal.

(d) That the workmen agree that by this settlement the instant dispute is fully and finally settled and that there shall be no claim of whatsoever a nature arising out of the instant matter, other than as contained in this settlement.

(e) Both the parties agree that terms of this settlement are fair and proper.

3. That both the parties pray that the Hon'ble Tribunal may be pleased to accept the terms of settlement as fair and proper and may be further pleased to pass an award in terms of the settlement.

And for this act of kindness, both the parties, as in duty bound, shall ever pray

Dated this the 13th day of June, 1983.

Sd/- Illegible

For and on behalf of the workmen.

Sd/- Illegible

For and on behalf of the employers

[No. L-19012(116)/82-D IV(B)]

S. S. PRASHFR, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 26th July, 1983

S.O. 3101.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government Industrial Tribunal No. 2, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the management of Central Coalfields Limited and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 19-7-83.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) DHANBAD
Reference No. 136 of 1982

In the matter of an industrial dispute under S. 10(1)(d) of the I.D. Act, 1947

PARTIES :

Employers in relation to the management of Central Coalfields Limited and their workmen.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of the employers—Shri R. S. Murthy, Advocate.

On behalf of the workmen—Shri D. Mukherjee, Advocate.

STATE : Bihar, **INDUSTRY :** Coal,
Dhanbad, the 11th July, 1983

AWARD

This is a reference under S. 10 of the I.D. Act, 1947. The Central Government by its order No. L-24012(25)/82-D.IV(B) dated 24-11-1982 has referred this industrial dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication on the following terms :

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action of the management of Central Coalfields Limited, is justified in dismissing S/Shri K.S. Yadav, A.K. Banerjee, Narayan Gope, K.K. Chatterjee and S.S. Gupta (by two dismissal orders)? If not, to what relief are they entitled

2. These concerned workmen were dismissed consequent upon the finding of guilt in two disciplinary proceeding pending against them. The first disciplinary proceeding involved all these 5 workmen and the charges related to various acts of misconducts as embodied in the standing order applicable to the coal mines of N.C.D.C. Ltd. The charges were enquired into by Shri N.K. Gupta, Personnel Manager, Ranchi who submitted a report after enquiry that these charges framed against them have been proved. Second disciplinary proceeding related to disobedience of the order of transfer and unauthorised absence from duty of these 5 workmen. The domestic enquiry was conducted by Shri M.N. Tewari, Personnel Manager (Headquarters), C.C.L., Ranchi. He also found them guilty of the charges framed against them. The management of CCL considered the enquiry reports and by a single order in respect of both the proceedings dated 8-4-1982 dismissed these workmen from service. An industrial dispute was raised by the union of these concerned workmen, viz. Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union. Since conciliation ended in failure, this reference has been made to this Tribunal for adjudication.

3. These 5 concerned workmen are employed in various capacities in Kathara Area of CCL. They are actively associated with the Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union. In fact the workmen's case is that prior to the year 1977-78 there was no union in Kathara area to represent or champion the cause of the poor exploited workmen because the union in that area was simply a puppet union of the management. These concerned workmen under the leadership of Shri A.K. Roy, M.P. and President of Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union started looking into the long standing grievances of the workmen and initiated agitation against the corrupt administration and anti-labour policy of the management. But as soon as the Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union started functioning in the colliery/washery, the workers in general appreciated and strongly felt this union to be the champion of the rightful cause and started becoming the members of this union. This annoyed the management and the puppet union and thereafter the management at the instance of the puppet union started taking action against the leaders of the Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union viz.

these concerned workmen. The management started series of departmental action against these workmen and also involved them in some criminal cases. The gist of the case of the workmen is that the first set of charges against these concerned workmen were actually not established by evidence. In fact one of the serious charge was the subject matter of a criminal case in which there was acquittal on the ground that the charge had not been proved. It has been also urged that the charges against these concerned workmen related to normal union activities and no allegation of threat and assault and indiscipline on the part of the concerned workmen were either proved or falsely made in order to harass and dismiss the concerned workmen. It has further more been said that the charges were framed according to the standing order framed by the erstwhile owner of the colliery viz. NCDC Ltd. But thereafter the collieries were taken over by the nationalisation of the coal mines and the ownership was transferred to Central Coalfields Ltd. Since then there has been standing order for these collieries which govern all the nationalised collieries. In this context it is said that the management was wrong in applying the provisions of the standing orders framed by the erstwhile owner NCDC Ltd. which no longer held good after the Model Standing Order applicable to coalfields came into existence.

4. With regard to the second disciplinary proceeding resting with the question of disobedience of the transfer order and will absence from duty, the contention raised on behalf of the workmen is that the principle governing transfer was not followed by the management. These concerned workmen were transferred to far-flung places without any exigency of work and so such transfer cannot be justified and the order of dismissal resting on the violation of such order cannot be consequently justified.

5. The management on the other hand, has relied on the proceedings of the domestic enquiries and the reports of the enquiry officers in justification of the order of dismissal. It has been contended that the concerned workmen were rightly charged in a disciplinary proceeding for violation of the provisions of the standing orders as framed by the NCDC Ltd.. With regard to the applicability of the standing order of NCDC Ltd., to the collieries of Central Coalfields Ltd. the contention is that this has been done with the approval of the Government of India. On the question of transfer to distant places the management's contention is that on account of the activities of these concerned workmen it was difficult to run the colliery and other institutions of Kathara area and therefore these concerned workmen were transferred to other areas due to the exigencies of work. For these reasons stated mainly the management's case is that the dismissal order passed against these concerned workmen is justified.

6. The management had prayed for a preliminary hearing on the question of fairness and propriety of the domestic enquiry. The two enquiry officers were accordingly examined as witnesses and the enquiry papers were proved by these witnesses. On the date of argument on the question of fairness of domestic enquiry it was conceded on behalf of the workmen that the enquiry was fair and proper and so it was held that the enquiry was fair and proper. After that both sides have filed their written argument as desired by them. So, the only question to be decided is as to whether on the basis of the two enquiries and the evidence adduced therein, the order of dismissal can be justified.

7. Before I go to discuss the evidence which has led to the dismissal order, let us acquaint ourselves with the charges framed against these concerned workmen and said to be proved against them. Shri A.K. Banerjee, operator, Grade I, Kathara colliery is one of the concerned workmen. The charge against him is with regard to an incident on 19-3-80. On that day while Shri H.P. Sinha Sub-area manager was holding an official meeting with the I.W.O., Sanitary inspector and sweepers of Kathara colliery along with Shri N.N. Sinha, Sr. P.P. in Kathara Rest House Shri A.K. Banerjee forcibly entered into the house where the meeting was going on at about 9.00 A.M. When he was asked to go out and not to disturb the meeting, he displayed fighting and disorderly behaviour with the Sub-area manager and incited the sweepers to leave the meeting so much so that one or two sweepers left the meeting. At that time Shri Banerjee mis-behaved with S.A.M. Kathara and abused and threatened him. Again on 19-3-80 Shri Banerjee entered the Rest house with Shri

K.K. Chatterjee, K.S. Yadav, N. Gope and S. K. Ash and incited the sweepers to leave the meeting so that the meeting had to be abruptly end. For these acts he has been charged under Clause (i)(e)(i) and (q) of S.O. No. 17(1).

8. The charges proved against Shri S. S. Gupta, operator, Kathara washery is based on the following facts. On 23-3-80 Shri S.S. Gupta along with Shri S.K. Ash led a mob of 100 persons carrying Bhala, garansa, bows and arrows at 10.00 A.M. and marched through the premises of the office of the Sub-area manager. They shouted provocative and abusive slogans. He preached and instigated violence and threatened the officers in general and Shri H.P. Sinha, Sub-area Manager, Kathara in particular. The charge framed was under Clause (i)(e)(n)(t) of S.O. 17(1). On 23-3-80 at about 10.30 A.M. Shri S.S. Gupta trespassed into the premises of Kathara colliery Rest House leading an agitated and violent mob. He shouted provocative slogans, preaching and inciting violence and murder of Shri H. P. Sinha, Sub-area Manager present in the Rest House in connection with official work. He also stepped on the verandah to attack Shri H. P. Sinha, but was prevented by Shri R. P. Tripathy, the company commander, B.M.P. Giridih and his men. He was charged with Clause (e)(t)(n) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). He was also charged under clause (i)(u) (e) of S.O. 17(1) for abetment of attempt of murder of Shri H. P. Sinha in the aforesaid incident. He was further charged under clause (i) and (q) of S.O. 17(1) for obstructing Shri H. P. Sinha, B. N. P. Singh Dy, S.O.C. and Shri N. N. Sinha, Sr. P.O. from discharging their official work.

9. The charges proved against Shri Keshav Singh Yadav, L.D.C., Kathara colliery are based on the following incident. On 7-3-80 at about 12 noon he along with Shri N. Gope, operator, Kathara washery, unauthorisedly entered into the General office, Kathara colliery and abused Shri G. S. P. Sinha, U.D.C. and Shri I.D. Sharma, LDC and was charged with misconduct under clause (e), (n) and (q) of S.O. No. 17(1). In connection with the above incident he quarreled with the office staff Shri I.D. Sharma and Shri G. S. P. Sinha led violent and agitated sweepers of the office shouting slogans. This amounted to disorderly behaviour in the office premises which disrupted the office work and he was charged under clause (e) (i) and (t) of S.O. No. 17(1). Shri Keshav Singh instigated the sweepers of Kathara colliery to go on illegal strike from 3-3-80 to 8-3-80 and was therefore charged under clause (i) and (q) of S.O. No. 17(1). Then again during the period 5th March to 7th March, 1980 under the leadership of Shri K. S. Yadav the sweepers who were on an illegal strike, shouted abusive and provocative slogans against the officers of Kathara colliery. On 6-3-80 slogans were shouted under the leadership of Shri Narayan Gope and others that anybody having confrontation with them would be given a bath in night soil. He was charged under clause (e) and (r) of S.O. No. 17(1). Shri K.S. Yadav led the striking sweepers of 5th, 6th and 7th March, 1980 although he took leave from 3-3-80 to 6-3-80 on the ground that his mother was suffering from small pox. The plea on which he had taken leave was found to be false, and therefore he was charged under clause (a) of S.O. 17(1). On 19-3-80 Shri K.S. Yadav unauthorisedly entered in the hall of Kathara Rest House at about 11.00 A.M. along with Shri A. K. Banerjee, Narayan Gope, K.K. Chatterjee and S.K. Ash where the Sub-area Manager was holding a meeting with the sanitary personnel and disrupted the official meeting which was in progress. At that time Shri K.S. Yadav instigated the sweepers to leave the meeting and organise shouting of slogans in Kathara Rest House. He was charged under clause (e) (i)(q) of S.O. 17(1). On 22-3-80 Shri K.S. Yadav instigated the sweepers to throw night soil at the residence of the Sub-Area Manager, Kathara, in Kathara colliery office and at the gate and verandah of the quarter of Shri T. Prasad L.W.O. and as a result the sweepers did likewise in the morning of that day. He was charged under clause (e) (t) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). On 24-3-80 at about 10.30 A.M. he organised a mob of 100 persons and led a procession with lethal weapons which marched from the Kathara colony and shouted provocative and abusive slogans and also incited the mob to violence and threatened the officers with dire consequences. He was charged under clause (e)(f)(r) of S.O. 17(1).

10. The charges proved against Shri K.K. Chatterjee, Electrician, Kathara colliery are based on the following facts. Shri K. K. Chatterjee instigated and mis-led the sweepers of Kathara colliery to go on illegal strike from 3-3-80 to

8-3-80. He was charged under clause (q) of S.O. 17(1). On 19-3-80 Shri K.K. Chatterjee unauthorisedly entered into the hall of Kathara Rest House at about 11.00 A.M. along with Shri K.S. Yadav, A.K. Banerjee, N. Gope and S.K. Ash where the Sub-Area Manager was holding a meeting with sanitary personnel and disrupted the official meeting which was in progress. He was charged under clause (e), (i) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). On 22-3-80 with the help of sweepers and some outsiders Shri K.K. Chatterjee organised and illegal strike and unlawful assembly in front of the office of the Sub-Area Manager, Kathara in between 7 A.M. and 12 Noon and shouted provocative and abusive slogans against Shri H. Prasad and Sub-Area Manager in particular and other staff in general and also threatened them with dire consequence. He was charged under clause (e) (n) (t) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). Then again on 22-3-80 Shri K.K. Chatterjee with Narayan Gope and others incited sweepers for throwing night soil and accordingly night soil was thrown at the residence of the Sub Area Manager and also at the residence of Shri T. Prasad, L.W.O. and in the office of Kathara colliery which resulted in disruption in functioning of the office. He was charged under clause (e)(i)(t) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). On 24-3-80 at about 10.00 A.M. Shri K.K. Chatterjee organised a procession of persons armed with lethal weapons and marched from colony, Kathara shouting abusive and provocative slogans and also threatened the officers with dire consequences. The charge framed was under clause (r)(t) and (q) of S.O. 17(1). Shri K.K. Chatterjee had applied for leave on 24-3-80 on the ground of serious illness of his wife, but actually he was moving with the striking sweepers on that day. He was therefore charged under clause (a) of S.O. 17(1).

11. Charges proved against Shri Narayan Gope, Operator, Kathara colliery were based on the following facts : On 7-3-80 at about 12 noon Shri Narayan Gope along with Shri Keshav Singh Yadav unauthorisedly entered the general office, Kathara colliery and abused Shri GSP Sinha, UDC and Shri I.D. Sharma, LDC, staff of that office in a filthy language by referring to their mother and sisters. This charge attracts clause (r) (q) & (t) of S.O. 17(1) of the standing orders as applicable to Coal mines of NCDC Ltd. Shri Narayan Gope led a mob of violent and agitated sweepers to the general office of Kathara colliery on 7-3-80 as stated (i) above and who were shouting slogans. This amounted to disorderly behaviour on his part in the office premises and there was also disturbances to the work in the office and disruption of work of Shri GSP Sinha and Shri I.D. Sharma. This charge attracts clauses (i) (t) & (q) of S.O. 17(1) of the S.O. as applicable to the coal mines of NCDC Ltd. Shri Narayan Gope instigated and misled sweepers of Kathara colliery to go on illegal strike from 3-3-80 to 8-3-80. This charge attracts clause (q) of S.O. 17(1) of S.O. Specially during the period from 4th to 7th March, 1980 under the leadership of Shri Narayan Gope the sweepers of Kathara colliery who were on illegal strike shouted abusive slogans against the officers of Kathara colliery within the premises of the colliery. Specially on 6-3-80 slogans were shouted under the leadership of Shri N. Gope and others that anybody having confrontation with them will be given a bath in night soil. The charge attracts clause (e)(r) and (t) of S.O. 17(1) of S.O. On 19-3-80 Shri Narayan Gope along with other unauthorisedly entered the hall of Kathara colliery Rest House at about 11.00 A.M. along with S/Shri K. S. Yadav, A. K. Banerjee, K. K. Chatterjee and S. K. Ash where Sub-Area Manager, Kathara was holding a meeting with the sanitation personnel, and disrupted the official meeting which was in progress at that time, and slogans shouting was also done at that time. This charge attracts clauses (e)(i)(c) and (q) of S.O. 17(1) of the S.O. On 22-3-80 Shri Narayan Gope instigated the striking sweepers for throwing night soil at the residence of SAM, Kathara, in Kathara colliery office and at the gate and verandah of the quarter of Shri T. Prasad, L.W.O. and as a result the sweepers did likewise in the morning of that day under his personal direction. This charge attracts clauses (t) (w) of 17(1) of S.O. On 24-3-80 at about 10.30 A.M. Shri Gope organised a mob of 100 persons and led a procession armed lethal weapons which marched through the colony of Kathara and shouted provocative and abusive slogans. Thus he preached and incited the persons in the mob to violence and threatened the officers with dire consequences. This charge attracts clauses (e)(r)(t) of 17(1) of S. O. On 22-3-80 Shri Gope with the help of sweepers and outsiders organised an illegal strike and also unlawful

assembly in front of the office of the SAM Kathara between 7 A. M. to 12 noon and shouted abusive and provocative slogans against Shri T. Prasad, LWO, SAM in particular and other officers in general and also threatened them with dire consequences. This charge attracts of clause (r) and (w) of S. O. 17(1). On 22-3-80 at about 9 A.M. when the Administrative officer, Kathara colliery made arrangement to clean the night soil from the office through Shri Mahabir Ram, and Smt. Manju Kamin, Shri Narayan Gope arranged for some more night soil to be thrown in the office premises due to which the entrance of the office was blocked and the staff could not enter the office. This charge attracts clause (e) (i) & (t) of S. O. 17(1).

12. The concerned workmen had received the charge-sheets and replied to the charge-sheets. They denied their involvement in the alleged offences and the counter allegation was that since they took active part in the activities of their union and were office bearers of the union, the management was determined to oust them from service. The enquiry started on 12-4-1980 and concluded on 23-7-80. The enquiry officer submitted the report on 9-2-81 i.e. after a lapse of 7 months. The contention on behalf of the concerned workmen is that after submission of the enquiry report the management felt that the offences alleged were not of such nature and furthermore were not proved, so as to remove the concerned workmen from service. They further contended that due to this difficulty felt by the management, they issued transfer letters on 4th June, 1981 whereunder Shri A. K. Banerjee was transferred to Orissa area, Shri Narayan Gope to Bharkhana area, Shri Keshav Singh Yadav to Singroli area, Shri S. S. Gupta to Dakra area and Shri K. K. Chatterjee to Ranchi. They were also released by the same order. Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union served a strike notice challenging the illegal and mala fide transfer order. The Conciliation Officer was Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner(C) Shri J. N. Simlota, who held the conciliation proceeding. The conciliation ended in failure and the failure report was received in the Ministry on 19-9-81. The management issued charge-sheet for violating the transfer order on 6-11-81 i.e. after the submission of the failure report in the industrial dispute stated above. The enquiry started on 30-12-81 and concluded on 14-2-82. The concerned workmen were dismissed through a dismissal order dated 8-4-82.

13. The above in brief are the facts of the case leading to dismissal of these concerned workmen. Since they are based on charges said to have been proved against the concerned workmen, we have to discuss the evidence in order to find out whether the dismissal order is valid.

14. In the first domestic enquiry the incidents of the various dates mentioned in the charge sheets relates to sweepers strike. In none of the charge-sheets any of the sweepers were involved. Moreover, the same offences serve as the basis of the criminal case lodged by the management against the concerned workmen which was registered as G. R. Case No. 177 of 1980 T. R. No. 1292 of 1983 After trial these concerned workmen were acquitted. The contention on behalf of the workmen is that on the basis of the same evidence the management should not have recorded the order of dismissal of these concerned workmen. However, we would like to consider what evidence has been given.

15. MW-1, Shri T. Prasad is a Labour Welfare Officer. His evidence has been criticised on the ground that his evidence does not actually involve these concerned workmen as he has spoken about this incident generally. Moreover, as a Labour Welfare Officer he should not have featured as a witness for the management. But what has been contended is that the Labour Welfare Officer has to function as a non-partisan officer and the management was wrong in involving him in the dispute of this nature between the union and the management. MW-2 Shri S. Prasad has said against Shri Keshav Singh Yadav and Shri Narayan Gope. His evidence in cross-examination may be quoted in order to show that he actually did not see the incident himself. "I heard Shri I. D. Sharma's voice in the Bill Section. Then I came out of the Bill section and then went towards main gate and saw there was some quarrel amongst themselves. I enquired about it and Shri I. D. Sharma told that the above mentioned

persons were abusing Shri G.S.P. Sinha". Furthermore he has not stated reason of slogans by Shri Narayan Gope and Shri Keshav Singh Yadav. It will be relevant to quote his evidence in cross-examination :

Q. Have you seen who has thrown night soil in front of the main office gate ?

A. No

Q. Who were giving slogans as you stated.

A. Since I was inside the office, on hearing the slogans I did not see who were there.

Q. In your statement you said Shri R. D. Sharma told you that S/Shri Narayan Gope and Keshav Singh Yadav who were abusing Shri G.S.P. Sinha—have you personally witnessed it ?

A. I did not hear any abuse personally before I reached the spot.

Q. Whether did you see S/Shri I. D. Sharma and G.S.P. Sinha when you came from Bill Section hearing the halla ?

A. I saw Shri I. D. Sharma in front of the gate at the verandah and Shri G.S.P. Sinha was not there at that time. He was sitting in the manager's room nearby the gate."

16. It has been contended on behalf of the workmen that the allegation against S/Shri Narayan Gope and Keshav Singh Yadav is that they abused Shri G.S.P. Sinha. But according to the witness, MW-2, Shri G.S.P. Sinha was not on the spot and furthermore in corroboration of the charge against these two workmen, Shri G.S.P. Sinha has not been examined.

17. MW-3 Shri I.D. Sharma has said about the alleged incident of abusing Shri G.S.P. Sinha. Shri Sharma in his evidence has said that he had taken active part during the sweepers strike and announcing on mike for withdrawal of the strike.

18. MW-4 Shri M.D. Singh has deposed that he came to the Sub Area Office at about 8 AM and found that the sweepers were shouting slogans. According to his evidence, Shri Narayan Gope was present there, but at some distance. On 22-3-80 he came to his office at about 7.45 AM when he learnt from sanitary inspector that the sweepers had left the premises after throwing night soil. He has admitted that he could not say who has thrown night soil. With regard to the incident of 22nd March, 1980 he has said that he has seen Shri Shyam Lal Sengupta and one outsider Shri Santosh Kumar Ash. So, except for involving some of the concerned workmen, in leading the procession of the sweepers, this witness has actually said nothing.

19. MW-5 B.N.P. Singh in his evidence has stated about Shri S.S. Gupta and Shri Santosh Kumar Ash leading a procession near the Rest House. They were shouting "H. P. SINHA MURDABAD H.P. SINHA KO BOTI BOTI KAR DEO". His evidence is that various slogans were raised and some persons started climbing the wall of the verandah. But Shri Tripathy, Havildar of B.M.P. took out his revolver from his pocket and 3 armed guards came out with guns and stopped them out. It will appear that the evidence of Shri B.N.P. Singh is divergent from the incident as related in the chargesheet. Moreover, in the Rest House if there were B.M.P. people the processionists would hardly venture to attack the Sub-Area Manager. None of the B.M.P. people have been examined as witnesses of this occurrence. The contention on behalf of the workman is that apparently a serious charge has been framed in order that serious action could be taken against Shri S.S. Gupta.

20. MW-6 Shri Nandan Singh, Head security guard has said that on 5-3-80, sweepers started raising slogans at about 8 A.M. near the main office gate. They were saying "T. PRASAD MURDABAD-T. PRASAD CHOOH HAI". He has further said that on 6-3-80 in the morning sweepers brought night soil in tin to the main office gate and kept the same there. They also raised slogans. On 22-3-80 he was on duty at the mines and at 10.00 A.M. he came to know

that the sweepers had thrown night soil in front of the residence of Sub Area Manager. He went there as directed and found sweepers coming back from the direction of the Sub Area Manager's residence. His evidence does not involve any of the concerned workmen in the incident of raising slogans and putting the night soil at the office gate and outside the residence of the Sub Area Manager.

21. MW-7 Shri Nakul Rajwar has said about the alleged procession led by Shri Santosh Kumar Ash and Shri Shyamlal Sengupta. In his cross-examination he has admitted although the procession was taken on 23-3-80 and 24-3-80 there was no jhanjhat.

22. Shri H.P. Sinha the Sub-Area Manager is MW-8 and he has given the background of the sweepers agitation led by B.C. K. Union. He had tried to pacify the sweepers in a meeting, but two of the concerned workmen viz. S/Shri A.K. Banerjee and Narayan Gope entered and asked the sweepers to go out. He, therefore, could not hold the meeting. He then says about the throwing of night soil in front of the office and his residence. He has also spoken about the incident in the Rest House where he was in Room No. 2. He says that Shri Santosh Kumar Ash delivered a speech before the demonstrators and the processionists also raised slogans against him. He speaks about Shri Shyamlal Gupta being present at that incident. He has said that when the mob became violent at the instance of Shri Shyamlal Gupta, Shri R.P. Tripathy, D.S.P., B.M.P who was present in the Rest House saved the situation. It will appear that in this incident the witness involves Shri Shyamlal Gupta. The incident is of 23-3-80. But on that day Shri Shyamlal Gupta was present in Giridih Court as bailer. A photo-stat copy of bail bond of Giridih Court has been filed in this court to show that on that day Shri Shyamlal Gupta was in Giridih and not in Kathara Rest House.

23. In support of their case the workmen examined DW-1 Shri Makki Khan, Loco driver, DW-2 Shri Mohiuddin, fitter, excavation, DW-3 Shri Ramlal Das, operator, DW-4 Shri A.C. Chakravorty. Besides that the workmen also gave their statement in support of their respective cases.

24. In a case like this it is pertinent to note that there should be a line of demarcation between the union activities which are permissible and such activities detrimental to the interest of the work which the workmen are expected to do. The purpose of the union is to protect the legitimate right of the workmen and in course of the same they are entitled to ventilate their grievances in a procession and they can even resort to strike as a method of enforcing their legitimate demand. In this case processions were taken out and even strike was resorted in order to secure the legitimate demand of the sweepers. There was a strike and some actions were taken by the sweepers which created a lot of bitterness in the minds of the officers of the management. This led to several actions including a proceeding under S. 107 Cr. P.C. and a criminal case against the leaders of the movements, i.e. executive of Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union. I may point out that Shri A. K. Banerjee is the President of B.C.K. Union, Shri Keshav Singh Yadav and Shri Nagrayan Gope are Secretaries of the union, Shri K. C. Chatterjee is Vice President of the Union and Shri S. S. Gupta is the Executive Committee Member of the Union. None of the sweepers have been involved in any of the proceeding either departmental or criminal. The contention on behalf of the workmen is that ever since B.C.K. Union was formed, the management is to crush the leaders of the union. Now we cannot ignore this fact as a cause of bitterness between the officers of the management and the leaders of B.C.K. Union. I have tried to scrutinise the evidence adduced in this case to show that there is no convincing evidence to hold them guilty of any of the charges framed against the concerned workmen. In the context of bitterness, it is likely that some of the concerned workmen may have uttered objectionable slogans and showed militant attitude. But neither they nor the processionists adopted any violent attitude. I am also confident in my mind that if the officers of the management had approached the executives of the union in a conciliatory manner, and had attended to the grievances raised by them, such a situation which led to aggressive attitude against the Sub Area Manager and the Officers of the management would have been avoided. Suffice it to say that the charges in respect of the first domestic enquiry would come within the scope of legitimate union activities and so the charges could not be considered to be serious enough to warrant the dismissal of the concerned workmen.

25. The second domestic enquiry is in respect of violation of the transfer order issued on 6-11-81 under which these concerned workmen were transferred to different areas far away from their place of posting. The enquiry was conducted on 30-12-81 in which only one witness was examined and the workmen were dismissed on 14-2-82. It has been contended on behalf of the workmen that the transfer order was illegal, mala fide and motivated because the President, Vice President, Secretaries and the Executive Committee Member of the union were in block transferred with the sole aim to put an end of Bihar Colliery Kamgarh Union at Kathara colliery and washery. There is no doubt that the management felt that these workmen were troublesome and therefore they were not transferred in ordinary course, but with the idea to stop the activities of B.C.K. Union which was troubling the management. It is also proved that the efforts of the management should be to see that no handicap should be put in the normal functioning of the union, but due to this action that the executive committee members of B.C.K. Union would come to an end. In this connection it is noteworthy that the executive committee members of B.C.K. Union had caused the officers of the management too much of annoyance by creating a stir of the sweepers with the result that the management was faced with sanitary problem. The solution lay in meeting the legitimate demand instead of provoking the members of the union which raised an ugly situation so much so that the sweepers chose to throw night soil at the gate of the office and in front of the residence of the Sub Area Manager.

26. The motive of the management in this transfer are to pack this workmen away as soon as possible and so by the transfer letters they were immediately received without affording them an opportunity to put up any representation. of B.C.K. Union so that the trade union activities of B.C.K. Union could be stopped. The standing order requires that transfer can be effected for exigency of work. In the instant case the grounds for transfer is for administrative reasons as shown by the letters of transfer. The exigencies of work means that the places of posting demanded workmen of a particular type due to efficiency reasons. In this case the management has not shown any reason why the services of these concerned workmen were more necessary at the places of posting to which they were transferred. Instead they were transferred because of their presence at Kathara area would be detrimental to the interest of the administration. It is clear that the reasons behind transfer cannot be said to be consistent with the provisions of Standing order relating to such transfer.

27. The above discussions will show that the dismissal of these concerned workmen passed on the two sets of charge sheets cannot be said to be justified. The management should have borne in mind that the concerned workmen against such transfer had raised an industrial dispute and the failure report had been already sent to the Government of India. In fact a reference has already been made to this court and the dispute which is pending for adjudication. The management could have waited for a decision of the Tribunal in the transfer matters instead of hastening to dismiss the concerned workmen for violation of the transfer order.

28. As a result of the above discussions the reference is answered accordingly.

The action of the management of Central Coalfields Ltd is not justified in dismissing S/Shri K.S. Yadav, A. K. Banerjee, Narayan Gope, K.K. Chatterjee and S.S. Gupta (by two dismissal orders). Consequently, the concerned workmen should be deemed to be in the service of Kathara colliery of Central Coalfields Ltd. from the date of their dismissal. They are also entitled to their back wages and other emoluments from the date of dismissal till they are reinstated in their job.

This is my award.

J. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer

[No. -L-24012 (25)/82-D. IV(B)]

S. S. PARASHER, Desk Officer

New Delhi, the 28th July, 1983

S.O. 3102.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Central Government Industrial Tribunal Calcutta-69, in the industrial dispute between the employer in relation to the management of Parasea Open Cast Project of Eastern Coalfields Ltd. and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th July, 1983.

**CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL :
CALCUTTA**

Reference No. 40 of 1982

Parties :

Employers in relation to the management of Parasea
Open Cast Project of Eastern Coalfields Ltd.

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

M. P. Singh.—Presiding Officer.

APPEARANCES :

On behalf of Employers—Sri A. Choudhury, Counsel,
with Sri M. N. Kar, Advocate.

On behalf of Workmen.—Sri S. Roy, Advocate.

STATE : West Bengal

INDUSTRY : Coal

AWARD

By Order No. L-19012(18)/80-D.IV(B) dated 17 December 1980 read with order No. S-11025(5)/82-D.IV(B) dated 11-10-82 the Government of India, Ministry of Labour sent to this Tribunal the following dispute for adjudication :

"Whether the action of the management of Parasea Open Cast Project of the Eastern Coalfields Limited in dismissing Shri Deonath Yadav, E. P. Fitter from service with effect from 1st August, 1979 is justified? If not, to what relief is the said workman entitled?"

2. At the domestic enquiry the concerned workman Deonath Yadav was found guilty of the charge of assaulting his two superior officers viz. the Project Officer D. Dey (MW-1) and the Sr. Executive Officer (Excv) B. N. Addy (MW-2) of Parasea Open Cast Project on 3rd July 1978 at about 9.30 a.m. in the morning by kicks, fist and blows in the following circumstances. At the said time D. Dey B. N. Addy and the Manager N. Banerjee were standing on the top of the over burden face (also called the earth bench of the quarry) and were discussing some working arrangements. D. N. Yadav went there with 10 or 12 employers of the open cast project. He immediately demanded supply of gum boots for all the workers. D. Dey told him that there was no stock of gum boots and that as soon as they would be received, distribution will be made. Upon this D. N. Yadav became violent and said to them that they will not be allowed to move unless gum boots were supplied immediately and saying this he proceeded towards the project officer, caught hold of his hands and started pushing him towards the edge of the over-burden face which was 25' high from the stone bench. B. N. Addy intervened. Luckily the project Officer was saved from the dangerous situation otherwise he could have dropped down from the overburden face and might have been killed. But D. N. Yadav kicked Addy 3 or 5 times and pushed him violently. Addy fell down on the ground but even then Yadav hurled fists and

blows on him. D. Dey ran to rescue Addy. Then Yadav dashed D. Dey violently. D. Dey also fell on the ground and his wrist watch was damaged and he received injury on his person. Thereafter Yadav and his men left the spot and went away. Yadav was accordingly charged with misconduct of assault under Sec. 17(1)(r) of the Model Standing Order applicable to coal industry. A disciplinary action was taken. In the enquiry held by Sri N. R. Chatterjee D. N. Yadav was found guilty of the charge of assault. The enquiry report, Ext M-5 is dated 26th April 1979. The management accepted the finding of the Enquiry Officer and dismissed D. N. Yadav, the E. P. Fitter from service by order dated 1st August 1979. The dismissal order is Ext. M-6 marked by this court with consent of parties. The above facts regarding the time, place and manner of occurrence have been supported by the evidence of MW-1 D. Dey, the Project Officer, MW-2 B. N. Addy, the Senior Executive Officer (Excv) and N. Banerjee the Manager, all of Parasea Open Cast Project. They have not been shaken in cross-examination. The story told by them has been accepted by the Enquiry Officer. The enquiry was found fair and proper by the Dhanbad Tribunal by order dated 22 June 1982.

3. This case has been heard under Section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is settled law that the tribunal has undoubted power to reappraise the evidence for itself and to come to its own conclusion, but, as observed in Workmen of Fire Stone and Rubber Co. v The Management, 1973 Lab IC 851 in para 48 at p. 869, "If a proper enquiry is conducted by an employer and a correct finding arrived at regarding the misconduct, the tribunal even though it has now power to differ from the conclusions arrived at by the management, will have to give very cogent reasons for not accepting the view of the employer. Further by holding a proper enquiry, the employer will also escape the charge of having acted arbitrarily or mala fide". Keeping this principle in view let us see whether there are very cogent reasons for not accepting the view of the Enquiry Officer.

4. Sri S. Roy, Advocate argued that D. N. Yadav examined 5 witnesses including himself in support of the defence case that D. N. Yadav was assaulted by Addy (MW-2) who caught hold of his testicles and pulled them hard when Yadav had approached the Manager on 3 July 1978 for gum boots but the Enquiry Officer disbelieved them on the wrong ground that they were not present. It was pointed out that even according to MWs, the defence witnesses were present as they had said that Yadav came to the spot along with 10 or 12 others. My attention was drawn to the evidence of MW-2 Addy who named Md. Mian (MW-2), Basant Harijan, Ram Dular Lohar (WW-4), Sahdev Kole (WW-3), Nagina Rajbhar (WW-5), Lagan Majhi and others as having accompanied D. N. Yadav (WW-1) to the place of occurrence. On the basis of this evidence it was urged that the defence witnesses were present there and they had seen the occurrence and they should not have been disbelieved. The argument is based upon misconception. The case of Yadav was that his witnesses came to the place of occurrence on hearing his shout; that those witnesses were working in a shovel at a distance of about 20'. It is not the defence case that the said witnesses were present at the place of occurrence from before or that they had come along with Yadav. The defence witnesses Mr. Mian, Sahdeo Kole, Ramdular Lohar and Nagina Rajbhar themselves stated that they had come to the place of occurrence on hearing the shout of D. N. Yadav. It cannot therefore be validly argued that according to MWs also the defence witnesses were present at the spot. The evidence of MW-2 is correct. It seems to me that some of those 10 or 12 persons who came with Yadav became witnesses and gave a false story that they had come from another place on hearing the shout of Yadav. The Enquiry Officer has discussed the defence case and the defence witnesses in detail in several paragraphs. Each witness has been discussed one by one. After giving full considerations to their case the Enquiry Officer disbelieved the defence witnesses and in my opinion very rightly. He has given good reasons for disbelieving them. Further, it is to be noticed that the evidence of WWs is not supported by probabilities of the case. It is not probable that D. N. Yadav, a leader of AITUC (Colliery Mazdoor Sabha) would come alone

to demand gum boots for all the workmen. The probability is that he would come with some others. The evidence of the three witnesses of the management who are all officers is, I think, supported by probability also. It is unbelievable that Mr. Addy (MW-2) being a Senior Executive Engineer would catch hold of the testicles of D. N. Yadav without any rhyme and reason. The Enquiry Officer has pointed out in his report that neither in the reply to the charge (Ext. 2) dated 8 February 1978 nor in his complaint letter in Hindi (Ext. 9) dated 3 July 1978 made to the management any mention was made by Yadav that his testicles had been caught by Mr. Addy. The Enquiry Officer has quoted the relevant contents of the letter Ext. 9. "Sr. Executive Engineer Hamko Dhamkata Hue Bola ki Maj Tumko Khatam kar dunga". I have also perused that letter. Except the above there is nothing against them. On this ground alone the defence witnesses are liable to be thrown out. It is remarkable that in that letter the names of Ramdular Lohar (WW 4) Md. Mian (WW 2), Basant Rajbhar and Nagina Rajbhar (WW 5) who deposed about catching of testicles have been mentioned. Still we do not find any mention of the story of catching the testicles. This letter was filed by the management as desired by Yadav himself. Not only that. There is no suggestion to MW 1 of MW 2 (the two victims of assault) that MW 2 had caught hold of the testicles of Yadav. To me it appears that it was a cooked up story invented by D. N. Yadav to save himself. I think that all the defence witnesses (WW 2 to WW 5) told a lie when they said that they came to the place of occurrence on hearing cry of D. N. Yadav and that they had seen the catching of testicles. It is peculiar that none of the defence witnesses would enquire from D. N. Yadav as to why the occurrence had taken place. In disbelief them. I believe MW 2 B. N. Addy who said that they and some others had come there along with D. N. Yadav. Yadav did not produce any medical certificate. His story that he went to the dispensary and did not find the doctor is not believable. The Enquiry Officer rightly disbelieved the defence story.

5. It was next argued by Sri S. Roy, Advocate for the Union that the Enquiry Officer did not mention the evidence which was favourable to defence and he has mentioned only the evidence which was unfavourable to the defence. In my opinion this argument is wholly devoid of merit. I have perused the entire report of the Enquiry Officer dated 26 April 1979 which is nine hand-written pages. He has referred to the entire evidence on record adduced by the parties. The comment made by the defence counsel therefore, is without any foundation.

6. Another contention raised by Sri Roy is that the Enquiry Officer relied on the medical report (Exts 4) relating to the assault although the doctor was not examined. In my opinion, the Enquiry Officer has simply referred to the medical report because the same was filed in the case. He has not stated anything more. He has believed the evidence of the three witnesses MW 1, MW 2 and MW 3 and on the basis of their evidence he has found D. N. Yadav guilty of the charge of assault. I take the same view. The contention is rejected.

7. The next contention of Sri S. Roy is that the name of MW 3 is not mentioned in the charge-sheet as a witness and therefore, it should be held he did not see the occurrence. The contention has no substance. The manager N. Banerjee himself issued the charge-sheet. According to D. N. Yadav also the manager was present there when he went to the Manager for gum boots. It is the admitted case of the parties that at the place of occurrence all the three persons namely, Dey, Addy and Banerjee were present. So the contention is rejected.

8. Sri S. Roy next submitted that no Lawyer was cross-examining MWs 1 and 2 and therefore even if no suggestion was made to them about the defence case of catching the testicles it should not be taken seriously. In my opinion. It was the only vital defence taken by D. N. Yadav. In my opinion even a lay-man could put such suggestion. As observed in Enderby Town Football Club Ltd. v. Football Association Ltd., 1971 IT LJ 202 the Court of Appeal in England, "Justice can often be done better by a good lay man than a bad lawyer". The argument is rejected.

9. Sri S. Roy further submitted that there was inimical feeling between the concerned workman and the manager N. Banerjee against whom some complaint had been made by the concerned workman to the General Manager. My attention was drawn to a letter of complaint dated 27-9-77. He contended that D. N. Yadav was victimised. This letter was not filed before the Enquiry Officer. It was filed before the Dhanbad Tribunal and was marked as Ext W-1 during the hearing of the preliminary point. He rejected the contention regarding victimisation and termed the enquiry fair and proper. That is the end of the matter.

10. Sri Roy lastly urged that this tribunal should give relief at least in the matter of punishment. In view of the nature of offence committed by D. N. Yadav, I think the only reasonable punishment is one of dismissal and that was rightly awarded to him. The Gujarat case of H. M. Parmar v. Gujarat Electricity Board, Baroda, 1982 Lab IC 1031 relied upon by Sri Roy is not applicable to the facts of this case because in that case the alleged offence of theft was in regard to scrap materials worth less than Rs. 50 and in that situation the punishment of dismissal was not approved.

11. On a consideration of the submissions advanced by the parties and after perusing the evidence on record I find that very cogent reasons have been given by the Enquiry Officer in his well-written report for giving the finding of guilt of D. N. Yadav and I do not find any infirmity whatsoever in his finding.

For the foregoing reasons my concluded award is that the action of the management of Parasea Open Cast Project of ECL in dismissing Deonath Yadav, E. P. Fitter from service with effect from 1 August 1979 is justified. It follows that the concerned workman is not entitled to any relief.

Dated, Calcutta,

The 11th July, 1983.

M. P. SINGH, Presiding Officer.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जुलाई, 1983

का० अ० 3103—डेका थ्रम (विनियमन और उत्पादन) अधिनियम 1970 (1970 का 37) की धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार, केन्द्रीय बोर्ड के साथ परामर्श करने के पश्चात् देश में कोल याशरीज में, इसके साथ संलग्न अनुसूची में निर्दिष्ट कार्यों में डेका थ्रमिकों के नियोजन को तत्काल प्रतिषिद्ध करती है

अनुसूची

1. कच्चे माल को उतारना;
2. मैगनीटाईट को चार्ज करना; और
3. प्लाट को साफ करना, जिसमें स्लिपज, वेस्ट को हटाना, गंदगी साफ करना, मैगनीटाईट हटाना आदि शामिल है।

[सं० यू०/23013/11/77-एल डब्ल्यू]

आर० पी० नरुला, उप सचिव

New Delhi, the 25th July, 1983

S.O. 3103.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (37 of 1970), the Central Government, after consultation with the Central Board, hereby prohibits the employment of contract labour in the works specified in the Schedule annexed hereto, in the Coal Washeries in the country, with immediate effect.

SCHEDULE

- (1) Unloading of raw coal;
 (2) Charging of magnetite; and
 (3) Plant cleaning including removal of slippage, waste, muck cleaning, magnetite removal etc.

[F. No. 23013/11/77-LW]

R. P. NARULA, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 25 जून, 1983

का० आ० 3104.—केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33 ग की उप-धारा (2) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए भारत सरकार के श्रम और पुनर्वास मंत्रालय श्रम विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या एस० 11020/2/83 डी० 1 ए (i) दिनांक 2 मई 1983 द्वारा उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन गठित श्रम न्यायालय चण्डीगढ़ को उस श्रम न्यायालय के रूप में विनिर्दिष्ट करती है जो उस रकम का मूल्यांकन करेगा जिस पर उस धारा में निर्दिष्ट किसी असुविधा की संगणना हरियाणा, पंजाब, हिमाचल प्रदेश, जम्मू और कश्मीर राज्यों तथा चण्डीगढ़ संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के किसी उद्योग में जिसके बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार समुचित सरकार है नियोजित कर्मचारियों के संबंध में घन के रूप में की जाएगी।

[सं० एस०-11020/2/83 डी -I (ए)]

New Delhi, the 25th June, 1983

S.O. 3104.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 33C of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby specifies the Labour Court, Chandigarh, constituted under section 7 of the said Act by Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Rehabilitation notification No. S-11020(2)/83-DI(A) (i) dated the 2nd May, 1983, as the Labour Court which shall determine the amount at which any benefit referred to in that sub-section would be computed in terms of money in relation to workmen employed in any industry in the States of Haryana, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir and Union Territory of Chandigarh, in respect of which the Central Government is the appropriate Government.

[No. S-11020/2/83-DI(A)]

नई दिल्ली, 27 जून, 1983.

का० आ० 3105.—औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33-ग की उपधारा (2) के अधीन फाइल किए गए आवेदन जो इससे उपाखण्ड अनुसूची I में उल्लिखित है श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या का० आ० 1973 दिनांक 26 मई 1977 में विनिर्दिष्ट केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रम न्यायालय नई दिल्ली के समक्ष लम्बित है ;

और भारत सरकार ने अधिसूचना संख्या एस० 11020 / 2/83 डी I (ए) (i) तारीख 2 मई 1983 और एस०

492GI/83-13

11020/2/83 डी I ए दिनांक 25 जून 1983 के द्वारा औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम की धारा 7 के अधीन चण्डीगढ़ में एक श्रम न्यायालय गठित किया है जिसका न्याय क्षेत्राधिकार पंजाब, हिमाचल प्रदेश, हरियाणा, जम्मू और कश्मीर राज्यों तथा चण्डीगढ़ संघ राज्य क्षेत्र के ऊपर होगा

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 33 ख की उपधारा (i) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त आवेदनों से संबंधित कार्यवाहियों को उक्त श्रम न्यायालय नई दिल्ली से वापस लेती है और उन्हें उक्त श्रम न्यायालय चण्डीगढ़ को अन्तरित करती है। उक्त न्यायालय उन पर उसी प्रक्रम से कार्यवाही प्रारम्भ करेंगे जिससे वे उन्हें अन्तरित की गई है और विधि के अनुसार उनका निपटान करेंगे।

अधिसूचना

उन मामलों की सूची जो केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रम न्यायालय नई दिल्ली के पास लम्बित पड़े है और केन्द्रीय सरकार श्रम न्यायालय चण्डीगढ़ को अन्तरित किये जाने है :-

क्रम सं० श्रम न्यायालय आवेदन संख्या

1	2
1.	एस० सी० ए० सं० 538 / 79
2.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 446 / 81
3.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 445 / 81
4.	एस० सी० ए० सं० 443/81
5.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 401/81
6.	एस० सी० ए० सं० 408 / 81
7.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 398 / 81
8.	एस० सी० ए० सं० 190 / 81
9.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 133 / 81
10.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 406/80
11.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 44/81
12.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 404/81
13.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 422/81
14.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 423/81
15.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 424/81
16.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 425/81
17.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 9/81
18.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 38/81
19.	ए सी० ए० सं० 40/81
20.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 50/81
21.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 167/81
22.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 51/81
23.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 138/81
24.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 137/81
25.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 3/80
26.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 432/81
27.	एल० सी० ए० सं० 116/80

SCHEDULE I

- | 1 | 2 |
|-----|-------------------------|
| 28. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 156 / 81 |
| 29. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 155 / 81 |
| 30. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 110 / 81 |
| 31. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 95 / 83 |
| 32. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 93 / 81 |
| 33. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 92 / 82 |
| 34. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 57 / 81 |
| 35. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 56 / 81 |
| 36. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 42 / 81 |
| 37. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 174 / 80 |
| 38. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 237 / 79 |
| 39. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 34 / 78 |
| 40. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 76 / 83 |
| 41. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 33 / 80 |
| 42. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 41 / 79 |
| 43. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 41 / 81 |
| 44. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 442 / 80 |
| 45. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 22 / 80 |
| 46. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 533 / 79 |
| 47. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 138 / 83 |
| 48. | एल० सी० ए० सं० 139 / 83 |

[सं० 11020 / 2/83 - जी० - I (ए)]

एस० एच० एस० अय्यर, अवर सचिव

New Delhi, the 27th June, 1983

S.O. 3105:—Whereas applications filed under sub-section (2) of section 33-C of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947) mentioned in Schedule I hereto annexed, are pending before the Central Government Labour Court, New Delhi, specified in the Notification of the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 1973 dated the 26th May, 1977;

And whereas Government of India have constituted, vide Notification No. S-11020/2/83-DIA (i) dated the 2nd May 1983 and S-11020/2/83-DIA dated the 24th June, 1983, a Labour Court at Chandigarh under section 7 of the Industrial Dispute, Act with jurisdiction over the States of Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Haryana, Jammu and Kashmir and the Union Territory of Chandigarh;

Now therefore, in exercise of powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 33-B of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby withdraws the proceeding in relation to the said applications from the said Labour Court, New Delhi and transfer the same to the said Labour Court Chandigarh and the said Labour Court Chandigarh shall proceed with the proceedings from the stage at which they are transferred to it and dispose the same in accordance with the law:

List of cases pending with the Central Government Labour Court, New Delhi to be transferred to the Central Government Labour Court, Chandigarh.

Sl. No.	Labour Court Applications No.
1	2
1.	LCA No. 538/79
2.	LCA No. 446/81
3.	LCA No. 445/81
4.	LCA No. 443/81
5.	LCA No. 401/81
6.	LCA No. 400/81
7.	LCA No. 398/81
8.	LCA No. 190/81
9.	LCA No. 133/81
10.	LCA No. 406/80
11.	LCA No. 44/81
12.	LCA No. 404/81
13.	LCA No. 422/81
14.	LCA No. 423/81
15.	LCA No. 424/81
16.	LCA No. 425/81
17.	LCA No. 9/81
18.	LCA No. 38/81
19.	LCA No. 40/81
20.	LCA No. 50/81
21.	LCA No. 167/81
22.	LCA No. 51/81
23.	LCA No. 138/81
24.	LCA No. 137/81
25.	LCA No. 3/80
26.	LCA No. 432/81
27.	LCA No. 116/80
28.	LCA No. 156/81
29.	LCA No. 155/81
30.	LCA No. 110/81
31.	LCA No. 95/83
32.	LCA No. 93/81
33.	LCA No. 92/81
34.	LCA No. 57/81
35.	LCA No. 56/81
36.	LCA No. 42/81
37.	LCA No. 174/80
38.	LCA No. 237/79
39.	LCA No. 344/78
40.	LCA No. 76/83
41.	LCA No. 33/80
42.	LCA No. 41/79
43.	LCA No. 41/81
44.	LCA No. 442/80
45.	LCA No. 22/80
46.	LCA No. 533/79
47.	LCA No. 138/83
48.	LCA No. 139/83

[No. S-11020/2/83-DIA]

S.H.S. IYER, Under Secy.

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 जून, 1983

का० प्र० 3106—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुन्डम प्रभाग-1 के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबंधित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम० श्रीनिवासागराव होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय रामकोट हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुन्डम प्रभाग-1 डाकघर गोदावरी खानी जिला करीमनगर (आ० प्र०) के प्रबन्धतंत्र द्वारा श्री तातिपाली गान्तेयाही और ए० सी० कं० लि० रामागुन्डम प्रभाग-1 के भंडार अनुभाग के भार लादने और उतारने वाले अन्य 9 मजदूरों के पदनाम में परिवर्तन करने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-22011/5/83-डी-III-(बी)]

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 22nd June, 1983

S.O. c106.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. I and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7 and clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasarao shall be Presiding Officer with the headquarters at Ramkote, Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the action taken by the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. I P.O. Godavari Khani, Distt. Karimnagar (AP) in changing the designation of Shri Tatipalli Gattaiiah and 9 others Loading & Unloading Mazdoors of stores Section of S.C. Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. I is justified? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

[No. L-22011/5/83-D. (II) B]

का० प्र० 3107—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबंधित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उपधारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम० श्रीनिवासागराव होंगे जिसका मुख्यालय रामकोट हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुसूची

“क्या सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० के प्रबन्धतंत्र का मशीन खनन प्रचालकों मशीन खनन सहायकों और ए० एम०-50 प्रचालकों को (1) वर्दी (2) धुलाई भत्ता और (3) घूलि भत्ता न देना न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष के हकदार हैं?

[सं० एल-22011(24)/83-डी-III(बी)]

S.O. 3107.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasarao shall be the Presiding Officer, with headquarters at Ramkote, Hyderabad and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

“Whether the management of Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd. is justified in not giving (1) Uniforms; (2) Washing allowance; and (3) dust allowance to machine mining operators, machine mining helpers and A.M.-50 operators? If not, to what relief the workmen are entitled to?”

[No. L-22011/24/83-D.III.B]

का० प्र० 3108—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपाबद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स सिंगरेनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुन्डम प्रभाग-1 के प्रबन्धतंत्र से संबंधित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मचारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10

की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम श्रीनिवासा राव होंगे जिनका मुख्यालय रामकोट हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निदेशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स सिंगरैनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० डाकघर गोदावरी खानी के रामागुंडम प्रभाग 1 के प्रबंधन की सर्वश्री शोक याकूब अली, वालियुद्दीन अकुला पायेयाह जमाल रायामाल्लु, अवानुरी दुर्गायाह सुन्दिल्ला बीमेसाह केवाती हलैयाह, पम्प खलासियों (वर्ग -4) की 1-1-1981 से मजदूरी निर्धारित करते समय उन्हें एक बेतन वृद्धि न देने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो संबंधित कर्मकार किम अनुतोष के और किस तारीख से हकदार है?

[सं० एल-22012(22)/83-डी-III(बी)]

S.O. 3108.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. I and their workmen in respect of matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A, and clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an industrial tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasarao shall be the Presiding Officer with headquarters at Ramkote, Hyderabad, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Ramagundam Div. I of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Post Office Godavarikhani in not granting one additional increment while fixing wages of S/Shri Shaik Yakub Ali, Woliuddin, Akula Papaiah, Jamel, Rayanallu, Avanuri Durgaiah, Sundilla Beemaiah, Kodati Ellalah, Pump Khalas (Cat. IV) with effect from 1-1-81 is justified? If not, to what relief the concerned workmen are entitled and from what date?"

[No. L-22011/22/83-D.III.B]

का०आ० 3109:—केन्द्रीय सरकार की यह राय है कि इससे उपानुद्ध अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट विषय के बारे में मैसर्स एस सी कं० लि० रामागुंडम प्रभाग-III के प्रबंधन से संबंधित एक औद्योगिक विवाद नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच विद्यमान है;

और केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद की न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निदेशित करना वांछनीय समझती है;

अतः अब केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14) की धारा 7-क और धारा 10 की उप-धारा (i) के खंड (घ) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, एक औद्योगिक अधिकरण गठित करती

है जिसके पीठासीन अधिकारी श्री एम० श्रीनिवासा राव होंगे, जिसका मुख्यालय रामकोट हैदराबाद में होगा और उक्त विवाद उक्त अधिकरण को न्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निदेशित करती है।

अनुसूची

"क्या मैसर्स सिंगरैनी कोलियरीज कं० लि० रामागुंडम प्रभाग-III डाकघर गोदावरी खानी जिला करीमनगर (आ०प्र०) के प्रबंधन की जी डी के 9ए इन्क्लाइन के टेम्पर श्री गुरन बचैयाह का नाम 15-7-1980 से अपनी मस्टर रोल से हटाने की कार्यवाही न्यायोचित है? यदि नहीं तो कर्मकार किस अनुतोष का हकदार है?

[संख्या एल-22012(24) 83-डी ओ-III(बी)]

एस०के० बिस्वास, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3109.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the management of M/s. S.C. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. III, and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 7A and clause (d) of sub-section (i) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal of which Shri M. Srinivasarao shall be Presiding Officer with headquarters at Ramkote, Hyderabad, and refers the said dispute for adjudication to the said Tribunal.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of M/s. Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Ramagundam Div. III, P.O. Godavarikhani, Dist. Karimnagar (AP) is justified in removing the name of Shri Gurram Buchaiah, Tramme, GDK 9A Incline from their muster roll with effect from 15-7-80? If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

[No. L-22012/24/83-D.O.III.B]

S. K. BISWAS, Under Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 22 जुलाई, 1983

का०आ० 3110—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सौन्दरापाण्डी स्टोर्स 73 जी०ए० रोड मद्रास-600021 तमिलनाडू नामक स्थापन के सम्बन्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबन्ध अधिनियम 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबन्ध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/191/83-पीएफII]

New Delhi, the 22nd July, 1983

S.O. 3110.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Soundarapandi

Stores, 73, G.A. Road, Madras-600021, Tamilnadu, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(191)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3111:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता कि मैसर्स प्रदीप डाटा डिस्ट्रिब्यूटर्स I/995 पोस्ट बाक्स नं० 101 कोचीन-2 मट्टाचेरी गांव कोचीन तालुक जिला अरनाकुलम केरल नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/195/83-पीएफ-II]

S.O. 3111.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Pradeep Dadha Distributors, VI/995, Post Box No. 101, Cochin-2, Mattancherry Village, Cochin Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(195)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3112:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सिक्योर वेल 259-4, होस्पिटल रोड कानायन्नूर तालुक जिला अरनाकुलम केरल नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/197/83-पी० एफ०-II]

S.O. 3112.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Secure Well, 259-4, Hospital Road, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam Distt. Kerala, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made application to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(197)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3113:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स एक्जुरेट टूल्स प्राइवेट लिमिटेड ए-15/2, इन्डस्ट्रीयल एस्टेट मौलाअली हैदराबाद-500040 आन्ध्रप्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए,

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/214/83-पी० एफ०-II]

S.O. 3113.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Accurate Tools Private Limited, A-15/2, Industrial Estate, Moula-Ali, Hyderabad-500040, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(214)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3114:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स दि प्रीमियर इंजीनियरिंग कॉर्पोरेशन आचम्मा विलासम बिल्डिंग्स के०के० रोड, कोट्टायम, केरल नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/217/83-पी० एफ०-II]

S.O. 3114.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs The Premier Engineering Corporation, Achammavilasom Buildings, K.K. Road, Kottayam, Kerala have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(217)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3115:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स फ़ैरो अलायंस कॉर्पोरेशन लिमिटेड चार्ज क्रोम प्रोजेक्ट राठिया, भाद्रक जिला बालासोर उड़ीसा नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य

निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/227/83-पी०एफ०-II]

S.O. 3115.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Ferro Alloys Corporation Ltd., Charge Chorme Project Bhadrak, Distt. Balesore, Orissa, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(227)/83-PF-II]

का० आ० 3116.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स उड़ीसा इन्जीनियर्स एण्ड इरेक्टर्स, कुसालापुरम वाया गुजराथीपेटा, जिला श्रीकाकुलम, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[सं० एस-35019/245/83-पी० एफ० II]

S.O. 3116.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation of the establishment known as Messrs Orissa Engineers and Erectors, Kusalapuram Via Gujarathipeta, Srikakulam District, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(245)/83-PF.II]

का० आ० 3117.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स श्री विजयलक्ष्मी काटन कम्पनी यूरगुन्टला, कुड्डापहा डिस्ट्रिक्ट, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/246/83-पी० एफ० II]

S.O. 3117.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Sri Vijayalakshmi Cotton Company, Yerraguntla, Cuddapah District, Andhra Pradesh, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(246)/83-PF.II]

का० आ० 3118.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स सी० काठी रेसन, टिम्बर मर्चेन्ट, थोलागार, पुरम अम्बसमुद्रम, तमिलनाडु तथा इसके प्रशासन कार्यालय, 1/31 ए, पापानास मेन रोड, अम्बसमुद्रम तथा शाखाएं (i) 240 ए, मेन रोड, विक्रम सिगपुरम (ii) 9, सरमाजी रोड, कल्लिदाईकुरीची तथा फैक्ट्री ग्राम सं० 538/डी 26, मन्नार कोइल गांव सहित नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/252/83-पी० एफ० II]

S.O. 3118.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs C. Kathiresan, Timber Merchant, Thilagarapuram, Ambasamudram, Tamil Nadu including its Administration Office, at 1/31A, Papanasam Main Road, Ambasamudram and branches at (i) 240A, Main Road, Vikramasingapuram and (ii) 9, Sarmaji Road, Kallidaikurichi and Factory at S.No. 538/D-26, Mannar Koli Village, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section I of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(252)/83-PF.II]

का० आ० 3119.—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतीत होता है कि मैसर्स औरमरोडस फीर्किन्ट्स, बैल्लारी रोड, होस्पेट, 583201, जिला बैल्लारी, कर्नाटक नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि कर्मचारी भविष्य निधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए;

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/253/83-पी. एफ. II]

S.O. 3119.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ormerdos Fabricators, Bellary Road, Hospet-583201, Bellary District, Karnataka, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(253)/83-PF.II]

का० आ० 3120:—केन्द्रीय सरकार को यह प्रतिष्ठित होता है कि मैसर्स जे० महेन्द्र एण्ड कम्पनी, 6-1-145 से 149-12-डी पदमारव नगर, सिकन्दराबाद-500025, आन्ध्र प्रदेश नामक स्थापन के सम्बद्ध नियोजक और कर्मचारियों की बहुसंख्या इस बात पर सहमत हो गई है कि

कर्मचारी भविष्य विधि और प्रकीर्ण उपबंध अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 19) के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू किए जाने चाहिए।

अतः केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 1 की उपधारा (4) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त अधिनियम के उपबंध उक्त स्थापन को लागू करती है।

[संख्या एस-35019/254/83-पी. एफ. II]

ए० के० भट्टाराई, अवर सचिव

S.O. 3120.—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs J. Mahendra and Company, 6-1-145 to 149-12, D, Padmarao Nagar, Secunderabad-500025, Andhra Pradesh have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-Section (4) of Section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. S-35019(254)/83-PF.II]

A. K. BHATTARAI, Under Secy.

